

THE RADICAL.

FEBRUARY, 1867.

THE NEW BIRTH OF JESUS.

NEAR the ancient city of Syracuse in the island of Sicily, there was in old times, perhaps is now, a fountain whose waters were supposed to be connected with the river Alpheus in Peloponnesus. A legend was attached to it to the effect that Arethusa, the Nereid, while bathing in the river was surprised and pursued by the river god. To escape from him, she changed herself into a fountain, and passed under the sea to Sicily. The legend has a touching meaning as applied to Jesus, whose new birth, in another hemisphere, I would celebrate to-day. It is nearly two thousand years since the stream of that lonely life lost itself in the sands of time, and disappeared from human sight. Its course before its disappearance was a very short one. Four or five years at the most was the length of the life of Jesus. For that time there existed in Judea and Galilee, and the region round about, the noblest and sweetest piece of humanity that the earth had seen. He was indeed a sparkling spring of water. He was a pure river in a thirsty land, welcome to all parched souls. He was the gladness of the sorrowful, the refreshment of the tired, the cleanser of the impure, the quickener of the dying. Stainless and pellucid, taking no soil from the slime he passed over, inexhaustible in copiousness, even in flow, he rippled on, blessing all within reach of his wave. When he was born, a type of pure humanity came into the earth ; a nature rich in all human qualities ; purely human. The unhuman, the inhuman, the superhuman being was alike absent from his composition. Everything about him was human ; his faith, his affection, his mode and spirit of life. His religion was the natural unaffected piety of a tender heart. His philosophy was the account of things rendered by a translucent rea-

son. Human duty was his law, human love was his inspiration, human welfare was his impelling motive. There seemed to be no barrier between him and other human beings. He belonged to all alike on the same terms. He believed in human nature so entirely that he rested his whole appeal on its truth. The kingdom of heaven, he said, is in the human heart, and should be in human society. His doctrine was a doctrine of boundless hope for mankind. He was the enemy of everything that oppressed, discouraged, and retarded men. He was the friend of everything that cheered and lifted them up. He had faith that under brave influences the decrepit people about him, the halt, the maimed, the palsied, the leprous, would stand up on their feet and walk. The stories of miracle that are told by his biographers derive their significance and beauty from the faith they express, in the power of simple, believing manhood, to overcome all sorts of limitations, material, social, and moral, and to restore health to the bruised order of the world. His was the very spirit of freedom and obedience; freedom from the animal, obedience to the divine. He lived and labored, engaged and suffered in faith, that all was well; that all would be recognized as well by those who committed themselves without reserve to the principle of human kindness. Establish kindness, he said, between man and man, and you establish faith in God and providence. You enter on the path of perfection: you inaugurate the heavenly order of society. In the beautiful words of Renan, "Jesus was no founder of dogmas, no manufacturer of symbols; he introduced a new spirit into the world. He first proclaimed the kingliness of the soul. He created a heaven of pure spirits, where are found perfect nobility of mind, absolute purity, the liberty which society had excluded as an impossibility. He was the loftiest of those columns that show whence humanity came, and whither it tends."

For less than five years, men were permitted to see this beautiful vision. Then it faded. The fountain disappeared in the dark and bloody ground. Men beheld it no more. For eighteen centuries little or nothing is heard of Jesus. The Christ reigned, but Jesus was forgotten. It was Christendom that grew and prevailed, not Jesus-dom. Christendom was a prodigious thing. The history of it is the history of the best portion of the human race in one of its most momentous passages. It is the history of empires and dominions, of churches and states, of literature, architecture, painting, music. It is the history of the councils and diets by which the most imposing theology that ever found place on earth was fashioned. It is the history of priesthoods and temples, and altars and sacred rites, of

my
na
pec
tion
mo
the
ties
mid
up
wor
sacr
mos
anc
glor
His
rejo
in t
mitr
and
of J
T
we t
posi
has l
belie
lost
chan
ern w
edge,
peopl
opme
dence
huma
of its
trying
the ru
is bre
power
system
We
have
great

mysteries, emblems, symbols. It is the history of wars, that shook nations in pieces, of persecutions that wasted lands, and exterminated people; of tyrannies sanctioned in the name of heaven, of superstitions, as abject as ever bent men to the dust, of poms and ceremonies that dazzled the human reason by their glitter, and intoxicated the human sentiment by their richness. It is the history, too, of charities that kept the soul of humanity warm in the dark winter of the middle ages, of aspirations that bore the hearts of men and women up as on outspread wings of devotion that hallowed common life, of worship that spread an aroma over even the foulest epochs, and of sacrifice that poured the blood of the saintliest into the being of the most high. History, gorgeous and deplorable, magnificent and melancholy, splendid and sad. History of power and weakness, of glory and gloom, of faith and superstition, of soaring and grovelling! History which we read with mingled and conflicting emotions, now rejoicing, now bewailing. History of popes in hair shirt or in armor, in their hands the shepherd's staff or the sword, on their heads the mitre or the helmet. History of emperors and princes, of inquisitors and their victims, of crusaders and their wars; but not the history of Jesus.

That history seems now about closing one at least of its acts. If we take a glance at Christendom, its substance seems to be decomposing. As we examine Christianity, by which I mean what always has been meant by it, the system of faith and worship, based on the belief in Christ as the God-man whose sacrifice is the salvation of a lost race from perdition, it appears that the system is undergoing changes that look like dissolution. It has lost its hold on the modern world: of that there can be little doubt. The spread of knowledge, the growth of science, the rise of industry, the coming up of the people in all the energy of their wilful or intelligent force, the development of political economy and social science, the spirit of independence in thought, sentiment, purpose, will, deed, the self-assertion of human nature breaking out in all these directions, taking charge of its own affairs and claiming the right to judge of its own interests, trying everything by the rules of reason, and judging everything by the rules of expediency. What we call vaguely, the spirit of the age, is breaking away from Christendom at a hundred points with immense power, and is arrogating to itself the authority that the old church system claimed.

We read carelessly, in the morning paper, that the French troops have been withdrawn from Rome. But that fact marks one of the great epochs of history, and is charged with meaning. It signifies

the final parting between the world and the church. It is a historic fulfillment of the text: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." It intimates that henceforth the secular powers are to manage their own business. States are to be organized on their own principles. Governments are to be instituted and managed in their own interests and for their own ends. The pope of Rome may be the head of a church, but he cannot be the ruler of a state; he may bear the shepherd's crook, but he may not handle the sceptre or wield the sword. His priesthood may administer religion; they may not meddle with state-craft. They may have in their keeping the souls of men; they must leave the estates of men to the economists. They may regulate worship, they must let trade alone. They may ordain rules for the spiritual culture; they must not levy taxes, or hold courts. The church must stand fast in its own strength, must rely on its own virtue and truth; must win the support of men by its power to bless them, and discarding all foreign support, must seize men directly by the heart strings, or be content to let them go. For the first time in its long and eventful career, the Romish Church stands alone, out of the shadow of the throne, unprotected by the awe of the sceptre, undefended by the sharpness of the sword. For the first time it must represent simple religion, no more "Catholic Powers," no more "Papal States," no more "Catholic Majesties," and "Roman States," no more allies of "His Holiness," no more "Defenders of the Faith." The fact is of immense significance. Romanism as a religion feels it through and through, and prepares for a change in every one of its parts. So long as it was an empire as well as a religion, the imperial spirit displaced the religious. While it was mixed up with diplomacy, it neglected its spiritual ministers. When it was supported by great powers, and set side by side with them upon a throne, its temper was lofty and aristocratic. It ruled the people instead of serving the people: it listened to no call to consult their interests, bespeak their sympathies, meet their desires, fall in with their tendencies or lead their ways. But now, abandoned, thrown back on its popularity, it must like other religions pay court to the spirit of the age. As a religion, it has life in it for centuries to come; but its life must be coincident with the general life of the communities of men. It must come to men as a friend, not rule them as a dictator. So long as religion is mainly sentimental and fanciful; so long as people are most effectively addressed through the senses, by pageants and ceremonies and painted rites; so long as the credulous and superstitious abound; so long as men and women sigh for soul's rest instead of

aspiring to soul's vigor ; so long as men and women yield to the languid longing for authority in religious faith, and fear above all things an independent posture of soul before God ; so long as reason is excluded from the domain of divine truth, and feeling, emotion, imagination are allowed to hold possession of the whole field of sacred credence ; so long will Romanism be a flourishing and popular system. But it will be flourishing only while it grafts itself on the stem of humanity, and it will be popular only while it strikes in with the ideas and current life of the time. To be strong in the people's affection, it must be hearty in its alliance with the people's thought. Romanism is now in Europe little more than a piece of state and social decoration. In America the Roman element in it is fast giving way to the American spirit. Its forms will continue to be what they have been for centuries. Its symbols and ceremonies will be unchanged. Its priests will administer its ritual in the same dress, with the same movements, the same bowings and genuflections they always have practiced, since the church borrowed them from the ancient worship of Buddha. The dumb show will still be carried on in obedience to the tradition of the Buddhist priesthood : but the ideas, the interpretations, the applications of thought to life, the direction of effort will be very different. Already among us, Romanism confesses the power of the people, the spirit of the nineteenth century as we call it, by professing to be the friend of liberal institutions, by putting forward its claim to be the only religion that encourages popular government, by playing on the passion for show, by fostering education, by keeping its tyrannies in the background, and by cordially welcoming converts on easy terms.

In a word, it has taken its place by the side of other sects in Christendom, and with them takes its chance of living under law instead of above it, in an atmosphere of freedom. No doubt its new attitude will gain for it multitudes of converts ; but this multitude of converts will only modify it more and more, by bringing it down to the level of the general sentiment and life ; so that the more it spreads the more it will become diluted. As a power in Christendom it is passing away ; as an influence in society it may endure. But as an influence in society, it will prevail just in proportion as it submits to those laws of society whose supremacy is now acknowledged by thoughtful men.

The condition of Protestant "Christianity" suggests the same train of reflection that was started by the condition of Romanism. Protestant Christendom betrays signs of weakness in every part. The sects are multiplying divisions and discords. No evangelical unions make

evangelical unity. The creeds to-day combed by thought, scarcely hold their own against the lightest touch of reason. The great words are repeated still, but what different thoughts they convey to different minds, and what strangely contradictory opinions are made by different classes of believers to nestle within them! The creed is a nomenclature, now, not a confession, a manifesto, or a pledge. It gives the name by which people call themselves, not the temper in which they think, pray, or live. Modern life is not "Christian" in any intelligible sense. It has slipped away from the "Christian" system. It bows to no spiritual authority, it confesses no total depravity, it believes in no special providence, it has faith in no miraculous interpositions or revelations, it relies on no vicarious atonement. The gulf between "Christianity" so called, and the popular life of the old world or the new, is vast; it is immeasurable. All the great interests of society are conducted on principles that are deeply inconsistent with the "Christian System." All the great lines of movement run in an opposite direction.

The industrial interest is openly averse to it both at home and abroad. The intelligent and energetic working classes are thinking of other things than the salvation of their souls from a future hell. Questions of economy are occupying their minds. They are pondering earnestly the ways and means of improving their actual condition. They are studying the relations that exist between their several industries; the laws that regulate artisanship, manufactures, trade, principles of rent and taxation, claims respectively of labor and capital. They are thinking about representation and suffrage, and are becoming politicians. They look to social science for their revelations of truth, and to social progress for their future contentment. Full of wild thoughts and reckless desires, they seethe and ferment with new ideas of life and providence that shock the ministers of the popular church. They do not throng the churches, nor sustain them. Multitudes on multitudes of them never see the inside of a place of worship, never listen to a sermon, never put up a prayer. They know better what they disbelieve than what they believe. Their faith is in material things mainly, in political combinations, in Trades Unions, in the regenerating effect of plenty of work, cheap living and high wages. The newspaper is their oracle, the popular writer and speaker is their priest. Their worship is a nebulous but tossing and restless aspiration after the "good time coming," which is their conception of the kingdom of heaven. Their needs are enormous, their demands are many; but their *felt* needs are not such as the "Christian Church" can supply, and their demands are not met by the

ministers of the received religion. This seems to be the fact, pleasant or unpleasant as the case may be. The sects all admit it, sadly, as an evil omen. Those outside of the sects hail it as a sign of enlightenment and progress. It may be the one, and it may be the other, but there it is ; the industrial class, in so far as it is active, moves away from Christendom.

Political life is, if possible, still more unchristian than industrial life is. I do not mean by this, that it is immoral or depraved, unscrupulous or inhuman, for the leading politicians are very likely church-members, and the political tactics are no more unprincipled or dishonest than in previous generations. What I mean is this : that the spirit which animates political life, the rules it acts on, the ends it seeks, the principles it professes, are utterly out of accord with the rules and ends and principles of Christendom. The "Christian" religion does not control or guide, or influence statesmanship or party movements in any civilized land. Political life in Italy, where Romanism has been supreme for hundreds of years, and where the majority of the people are members of the Roman Church, breaks away from its old limitations, and pursues its own course. The ruling power in Catholic France scarcely acknowledges the existence of the Catholic religion. Protestant Germany puts her confidence in universal education and universal drill. No one acquainted with our politics would imagine that such a thing as Christianity had existence among us. Political life follows one principle, church life another. The spirit of politics is liberty ; the spirit of "Christianity" is restraint. The tendency in politics is towards Radicalism ; Christianity is conservative. "All over Europe," says Lecky, "the priesthood are now associated with a policy of toryism, of reaction or of obstruction. All over Europe the organs that represent dogmatic interests are in permanent opposition to the progressive tendencies around them, and are rapidly sinking into contempt." The clergy of the various creeds, the religious newspapers, the politicians who represent the piety of communities, are, with here and there singular exceptions, in antagonism with the most popular ideas of the generation. To be interested in the Established Church of England, or in the Sectarianism of America, is in just that proportion to be uninterested in the principles that promise reform to society. A competent observer and able writer said of Austria in 1858 : "The truth decidedly is that public opinion and public interest have ceased to be Christian in Europe."

In a word, that system of belief known as "Christian" all over the Catholic and Protestant world, no longer has a positive influence over

those who control the policies of states. Its ideas are not operative in the leaders' minds, its hopes are not vital in their hearts, its purposes and aims have no place among their ambitions. Another theory of human nature and human destiny is assumed than that which the divines inculcate; and not another theory merely, but a different theory, a theory so different, that it is at sword's points with the theologians and ecclesiastics on every issue, and is denounced by them as atheistical and devilish. Says Leckey again: "Liberty and not theology is the enthusiasm of the nineteenth century, the very men who would once have been conspicuous saints, are now conspicuous revolutionists; for while their heroism and their disinterestedness are their own, the direction these qualities take is determined by the pressure of their age." Even Cardinal Antonelli confesses that the doctrine of nationalities has now almost acquired the force of public law, which is the same as saying that the powers of this world have taken their affairs into their own hands.

Is Literature "Christian" in the ordinary sense of the term? Cast your thought over the literature of the day, in any department, and you will perceive that the Christian system of doctrines is barely recognized there. It is large, liberal, humane—but it is not Christian. It pays warm tribute to Jesus, but it says little or nothing about the atoning offices of the Christ. It believes in God, but it has no word about the Trinity; and the doctrine of human depravity and inability is put away as a thing of the past. Books of science, books of history, essays, fiction, romance—the periodical literature, so varied and copious, reviews, magazines, newspapers—are as free from all savor of the peculiar doctrines that are taught in the Churches, as if no such doctrines were ever heard of. Once these beliefs made the staple of literature: now they have no place in it. Once all the chief books that were written, were written within the circle of the Christian Faith; now all the chief books that are written, are written outside of that circle. Once the name Literature was applied, in the highest sense, to works that vindicated Christian doctrines, and expounded Christian ideas. Now, the works that vindicate these doctrines, and expound these ideas, are remanded to a place of their own—outside of literature. The truth is, that the active and cultivated intellects of our time, have silently, and without plan, deserted the Christian camp, and gone away into regions of thought which the Church has always regarded as infested with demons. The leaders and the followers alike, are looking to another country, or rather are joyously living in another country, and having a home feeling there. The Christian system is to them as if it were not. They think on

other lines. They reason on other principles. They teach from other premises. Their minds are saturated with ideas of truth and beauty, that are utterly strange to Christendom. The questions they raise are new. To the old questions they give new answers. The problems that engage their attention, are problems which to-day suggests. They write for objects that are peculiar to their generation. If they think of Christianity at all, they think of it as a thing of utter indifference, which has been bequeathed to Society by the older centuries, but which has no momentous meaning, and no vital relation to modern communities. The closer we think of this, the more palpable it is, that Christianity has no commanding place in modern letters. The modern mind has abandoned it ; not suddenly, or hastily, or pettishly, or for a moment ; but in the course of its providential direction it has swept beyond its lines. This is a fact of immense moment ; for the literature of an epoch gives expression to the inner soul of an epoch, in all its sentiments, aspirations, and purposes. The literature of an epoch is its complete confession of faith.

Art is unchristianized in the same way. The artist now confines his studies to nature and man. He paints mountains, trees, woods, water, flowers ; he paints portraits, scenes in domestic and social life. His pictures illustrate society. What sculptor or painter of fame chooses for his subject a Saint, or a Madonna — a Last Supper ; a Crucifixion ; a Descent from the Cross, or even a Nativity ? Go through any gallery of modern art, at home or abroad, with this thought in your mind ; visit the studios of our modern artists, and it will come over you with a great surprise, that Christianity has dropped out of art altogether. The lovers of Beauty do not go to it, either for their theme, or their inspiration. It is unreal to them ; unnatural, unlovely. There was a time when the chief employment of artists was the production of altar pieces, the decoration of churches and religious houses, the commemoration of scenes in the life of Christ, or of events in Christian history. Now this work is left to a few men of small repute, whose work is not classed with the work of artists at all.

I have just touched on a few of the more prominent indications of the decline of the Christian system in the modern world. We are already getting accustomed to think of Christendom as a thing gone by. If we search our thoughts severely, we should be surprised to find how far we had gone in this way of thinking. We should be surprised to find how habitually we left Christianity out of view in our public and private, our social and personal life. We are not "Christians" any more. The emblems of Christianity are all about

us. Our public worship retains its sentiment and its usage, but it does not retain its atmosphere; and most of the worshippers in any Church would be shocked if the real sense of what they said in prayer, read in Scripture, repeated in creed, or approved in sermon, were explained to them. Their faith is not in the confession, nor their prayer in the litany.

But at this moment the stream that disappeared in the sand two thousand years ago, and which during all these centuries had been flowing beneath these empires, palaces, thrones, altars, cathedrals, reappears on the surface of the earth. Jesus is newly born. The religion of Christ passes away; the religion of Jesus enters on its career. Christendom declines; Jesusdom awakes. The simple humanity that he represented, has become the distinguishing peculiarity of modern society. The spirit of personal independence of which he gave so illustrious an example; the spirit of human kindness which he exhibited so beautifully in his life, so divinely at his death; the spirit of aspiration which animated his attitude; the spirit of genuine simplicity, of natural enthusiasm, of unaffected cheerfulness, of practical earnestness, which rose in all his words and deeds, is the characteristic of the living portion of our own age. His faith in men and women is coming to be our faith; his respect for their greatness, his tenderness for their weakness, are stealing into our bosoms. His belief in the power of kindness to banish social evils, to institute better customs, to inaugurate and establish a new social order among men, is creeping into our politics, pressing into our laws, mitigating our criminal jurisprudence, reforming our prisons, abolishing our vindictive punishments. His prayer "Thy kingdom come" to us in this world, "Thy will be done on earth," is the prayer of all who earnestly pray in this generation. His recognition of the sanctity of woman comes home to us now with a sense of conviction which we cannot resist; it is moving us to efforts at improving her personal, social, and legal position, which will not be abated, and will not stop till she has all that belongs to her, does all that may be in her power, and throws her full influence into the mass of opinion of her time. His confession of the equal humanity of men of all sects, classes, religions, and races, springs to the lips of the earnest and the eloquent now, and publishes itself, not in books and speeches only, but in extensive plans for removing every kind of disability from every kind of person, for making all equal before the law, for giving all a fair chance in the race of improvement, for lifting all into that liberty, which is the right, the privilege, the necessity of rational beings. His cry: "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," is

echoe
the g
which
being
destin
accor
If
have
they
Him
they
may
line
Alph
thoug
Judea
living
ideas,
erty,
our d
from
drug.
for th
in Hi
Do
in Ch
has b
in son
That
of ear
prom
view
bodie
short
very l
the m
bread
indep
ducer
alway
you lo
that t

echoed by a host of reformers who are trying to mend the world ; by the great Masters in social science, who are thinking out the laws by which society advances ; by the statesmen who have at heart the well-being of the people : by the economists who teach that man has his destiny in his own hands, and is commissioned to shape his lot in accordance with the rules published in his constitution.

If Industry, Politics, Literature, Art, have abandoned Christ, they have as fully and unreservedly embraced Jesus ; for precisely what they speak out of their conviction, he spoke out of his sentiment. Him as a person they may not think about much ; him historically, they may not profess to know ; him in his finer individual traits, they may not appreciate or copy ; but their movement is essentially on a line with his. It used to be said that a cup thrown into the river Alpheus would reappear in the fountain Arethusa. The golden thought which Jesus threw into the stream of time from his stand in Judea, comes up again on this opposite side of the globe. If our living age have a faith, it is the faith that Jesus cherished, in moral ideas, in justice, goodness, mercy, truth, in uprightness and in liberty, in manly virtue, and in womanly tenderness. The catchwords of our day — "Liberty," "Equality," "Brotherhood," "Progress," come from the same vocabulary that he used. Beneficence is almost a drug. Volumes would not tell what is done in any modern country for the poor, the sick, the suffering, the insane, the guilty ; and done in His dear name.

Do you say that this work has always been done by every church in Christendom — Romanist and Protestant ? In a certain sense it has been ; but in another sense it has not been. Modern charity is in some important respects a different thing from "Christian charity." That was sentimental ; this is scientific. That was done as a means of earning blessedness in a future life ; this is done as a means of promoting safety and happiness in this life. That was done with a view to the saving of souls ; this is done with a view to the saving of bodies. That never forgot that people were here on earth but a short time ; this never forgets that Society is to live on the earth a very long time. That doled out alms to individuals ; this regulates the mutual relations of communities ; and like Jesus himself, breaks bread to a multitude. That encouraged dependence ; this encourages independence. That made people paupers ; this makes them producers of wealth. That said sanctimoniously, "the poor ye have always with you ; this says cheerily, "the poor ye need not have with you longer than you want them." That proceeded on the principle that the poor and miserable were made poor and miserable in order

that the rich and happy might practice alms-giving on them; this proceeds on the principle that the poor and miserable have become so through causes wholly removeable, and remain so to the detriment of all concerned. "Christian charity" has always tried to keep men contented with their place in society. Our charity tries to make them discontented with the bad places, and bids them stand up and walk. Christian charity dropped a tear on the wretchedness of mankind, and put up prayers for it; our charity drops a quick thought upon it and puts its shoulder against it to push it away. You perceive that the two Charities stand for entirely different things. They are born of different parentage. One is the child of the system which holds man to be depraved and helpless; the other is the child of a system which holds man to be a rational being, master of his circumstances. One is born of the spirit of patronage and pity; the other is born of the spirit of courage and command.

When we ask "Where is he who was born King of the Jews?" the answer is; "he is here in the faith, and hope, and endeavor of to-day." Not that the thoughts that burn, the energies that shoot in our time owe to him directly their suggestion or their power. They owe these to the knowledge and the necessities of the time; but they owe to him a tenderness and loveliness which they never would have had without him; they owe to him the inspiration of the heart that commends them to the kindly sympathies of men and women; they owe to him an association with the most touching devotion to the cause of humanity; from him they derive an element of heavenliness, and the title to call themselves a religion; the Religion of the Heart; the Religion of Humanity.

O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

[Continued from last Month.]

JOHANN WOLFGANG GOETHE.

HITHERTO we have found the poet a fresh, productive, hearty and genial youth; not an artist, but rather a genius—the reverse of Schiller in this respect, who was far less of a genius than of a self-determined artist; writing upon inspiration, not by self-determined consciousness. But in degree as this inspiration of genius manifests its inherent fickleness,—coming and going at its own pleasure,—and as the productions of these divine moods are held too

sacred to be sold for money—"it appeared contemptible to me to sell them for money"—the young poet learns to appreciate his father's early suggestion of a fixed and money-making career; and accordingly we find him sighing for a permanent occupation, for a self-determined sphere of action, which might at the same time yield him an honorable and meritorious income. He now begins to see dimly, how correctly his clear-sighted father had acted from the first, in urging him to a study of jurisprudence, as the means of obtaining an honorable and independent livelihood, than which,—together with its regular business vocation, ease and comfort—nothing is more essential to a poet, as glorious William Shakspeare so well knew and exemplified in his life. Visionary and growling Thomas Carlyle, of course, gives old Herr Goethe a round scolding for his prosaic notions about independent business, income, &c.,—which young Herr Goethe, however, followed to the letter, as we shall soon see, when he got to Weimar; and rants a great deal about the sanctity of the poet's vocation, &c., which is all fudge, considering that a shoemaker's or farmer's vocation, if but pursued in a godly spirit, are quite as sacred and reverential; and that the whole value of a man arises not from *what* he does, but from the spirit in which it is done. Goethe, as we have said, felt this want of a fixed business occupation sorely, and tried to redeem it in some way by assisting his father in law business. Still, this business was not very extensive, and left the poet rather too much leisure time to know well what to do with. Accordingly, he did, what is usual on such occasions; he fell in love. This time it was a certain wealthy young lady, whom we are introduced to as Lili, and whom he now seriously thinks of marrying. After many negotiations between the parents of both parties, the affair is happily settled, and a formal engagement entered into; engagements being in Germany of far more importance than we in this country can well conceive. After the engagement, of course, all the considerations which should have been entertained before, arise in Goethe's mind with disturbing earnestness. She is wealthy, he rather poor, and without a fixed income; added to this, is difference of religion, habits, manners. These perplexing and unloverlike reflections are encouraged by Goethe's sister, who persuades him most earnestly to break off his engagement, and finally succeeds so far as to obtain a promise to travel. A journey to Switzerland is undertaken (1775), and the occasion embraced to renew friendship with Lavater; but wherever Goethe's footsteps led him though those glorious regions, the memory of Lili looms up incessantly, and makes it appear cruelty to himself and herself, to tear

the sweet tie which unites them. He returns in a wretched mood, dissatisfied with himself, as well he might be, hopeless and comfortless. Lili has, of course, noted his strange and distant behavior; and now he positively tries to avoid her. The tie is broken before even the significant words are uttered. Sometimes his better nature gets control over him, and then he has notions of going with Lili to America, where all odious class distinctions and worldly considerations have no definite existence. But these moods are momentary, and vanish. Old Herr Goethe well notes the struggle in Wolfgang's heart, and treats him with all possible consideration. He encourages him to devote more time to poetical labors, but insists that doggerel, "occasional" verses, and loose nonsense be thrown aside. When Wolfgang suggests "Egmont," the father is delighted and keeps his son steady at it. But even "Egmont" cannot hold the charming image of Lili from the mind of the poet, and in intense disgust at his own irrepressible unrest, Goethe resolves to take to travelling once more, and seek peace, if possible, in Italy. But when almost on the point of starting for that country, fate throws the Duke of Weimar in his way, and instead of going to Italy, Goethe takes up his father's original plan, and secures for himself an independent existence, which shall leave him perfect repose and quiet of mind for his high vocation. This business existence was the superintendence of the Dukedom; it made him pecuniarily not only independent, but very comfortable; leaving him time, leisure, and opportunity enough for his true object on earth.

We have hitherto followed the life of our poet, if not altogether with approval, at least without any actual repugnance. For although he has been often in error, and has even committed one great wrong, which can nevermore be righted, we have found Goethe withal a cheerful, healthy, righteously inclined youth, inspired with high longings, and giving promise, that he will yet overcome all errors and evil ways. The Ideal still lives within him, constituting as yet the chief nourishment of his existence. But gradually, during his Weimar residence — and of this eventful period, ten years in duration, he has left not a single biographical note pertaining to his real life — we find a sad change stealing over him. Completely crystallized, we do not perceive this change until after the Italian travels, but it can be noted approaching with steady steps long before. A change was impending, and necessarily could have been foreseen; but it is the direction which it took which causes our sadness, and leaves us to mourn over the Goethe that might have been. Whether this direction was produced by his unfortunate and criminal alliance with

Frau
his sur
crime
to acc
all sul
left hi
labor
was a
at the
strive
great
ious f
to hav
therel
can b
faith,
school
"Life
natur
like
Goeth
crysta
for th
foldn
of na
on wh
theor
whole
ler h
his m
exper
voked
his sp
De
— tr
rema
and o
faith
many
Phil
phil
chara

Frau von Stein, and was supported by the general immoral tendency of his surroundings, we need not inquire ; it is clear to us, that one such crime as that, which connected him with Frau von Stein, is sufficient to account for the hereafter apparent looseness of Goethe's notions on all subjects relating to morality. His mirth and youthful gaiety soon left him at Weimar. He grew very industrious, underwent herculean labor ; indeed, labor became to him necessary refreshment. This was all as it should have been, the youth changing into a man. But at the same time he lost his previous inborn morality ; and did not strive to regain it by philosophical development. In this he was a great contrast to Schiller. Schiller also broke off with inborn religious feeling ; but with all the earnest vigour of a *man*, who really *wills* to have truth, he gave himself up wholly to a study of philosophy, and thereby really did attain that clearness and truth intellectually, which can be only thus attained. Goethe, like Schiller, had broken with faith, and the sacredness of authority ; but instead of going to the school of philosophy for truth, he appealed to the infinite so-called "Life," and the equally infinite so-called "Nature" for it. In life and nature you can only experiment, only get "inductively" something like probabilities ; but never the one immoveable truth. Hence Goethe, casting himself upon the infinite sea of experiments, became crystallized only in so far as self-consciously to abandon all search for the One unchangeable truth, and to trust himself to the manifoldness of life. Remarkably enough in his pursuit of a knowledge of nature, he did not follow his own theory, but adopted the very one on which speculative philosophy is based ; the *à priori* synthetic. His theory of the plant-creation, his theory of colors, and indeed his whole apperception of nature was altogether speculative ; and Schiller hit the truth exactly, when after Goethe had explained to him his metamorphosis of plants, he said : "But this is an idea, not an experience !" It is surely curious that Goethe should have been provoked because Schiller truly described the general theory, of which his special theory in this instance was only an application.

Devoid of Christian faith, and with a strong aversion to philosophy — true clearness was of course out of the question for Goethe — he remained in the region of groping and error, and plunged in deeper and deeper, as his original religiousness lost its hold upon him. The faith of childhood, which had clung to him and protected him for so many years, was gradually lost sight of altogether, and to the redeemer, Philosophy, Goethe refused to go for future succor. This aversion to philosophy was a natural instinct in Goethe, which he had not force of character enough to overcome. A purely intuitive mind, a *genius* —

in the profoundest significance of the word — he had cast aside the immediate faith in contemplation, which genius requires, and yet feared to give himself up wholly to philosophy, and thereby again to become a whole man — not a genius, but a *thinker* — because that step would have compelled a total change of character. He chose to balance between both sides, between genius and thinking; and thus he became that curious compound of an inspired poet and erring thinker, such as we shall find him hereafter until the last years of his life, when genius once more attained the upperhand, and asserted its sacred superiority.

The same change we have described as taking place in Goethe's moral and religious views and character, took place in Goethe's art-nature. Hitherto he had worked in the manner of a genius, of an inspired poet — to use Schiller's designation — of a truly *naïve* poet. But this was no longer satisfactory. He would no longer trust to the assertions of his political instinct, or genius; he would *see*, see the true object and manner of working of a poet. But here again he refused to go to the school of philosophy for enlightenment on the subject of art. Schiller had done so, and had built up a profound school of æsthetics, fixed immoveable rules, which thereafter guarded him in all his poetical undertakings. Schiller was never a naïve poet, and hence he had set himself, as he was bound to do in the sacredness of his calling, to investigate the proper character and ideal of the sentimental poet, and to aspire after *its* highest perfection.

Goethe, the naïve poet of his sentimental age, *par excellence*, refused to be longer a naïve poet, and yet at the same time, refused to ascertain what he ought then to be as a sentimental poet. Hence we shall find in his later poetical works an uncertainty and wavering which only the influence of Schiller tended to bring to some sort of order and fixedness. What might not the great genius of Goethe have given to the world, if through self-determination he had risen to pure light and clearness of his vocation, when the much less gifted Schiller was by it enabled to rise from "The Robbers," to "William Tell?"

The development in the character and poetical art of Goethe during his first ten years residence in Weimar and chiefly during his stay in Italy, and on which development he so prides himself, we can therefore only deplore. If he congratulates himself on extended knowledge of poetical art and manner of working, we mourn the loss of a fresh-hearted poet-genius, which only a thorough and exhaustive study of philosophy could have restored to original vigor. If Goethe prides himself that he has overcome not only physical disgust, by

anato
"kn
moral
and u
but d
life as
only
tempo
with t
tism.
being
studie
all the
only
ment
We
life, s
comm
enabl
under
to be
done
the co
Carol
in Go
which
return
gigan
ruffle
On
epoch
that h
victio
his re
of his
him in
ling, &
foot.
make
his fu
But
Weim

anatomical studies, but also moral disgust, and that "life" and "knowledge" have emancipated him from his childish notions of morality, and favor placed him upon a higher, more comprehensive and universal standpoint, we from our standpoint of morality cannot but deeply regret this effect of "culture." The quiet submission to life as it is and the acceptance of "all that exists as rational," we can only regard as the result of a fear to battle with his mother-inherited temperament; a laziness to change his organization in accordance with the demands of true philosophy, a true and thorough conservatism. He never appears to us as a clear, self-determining moral being, and the bent of his inclinations are visible even in his natural studies and in the invectives of his satire. The profound interest in all the problems which agitate mankind, no longer lives in him. He only feels an interest in the problems which his individual temperament suggests.

We have been thus careful to distinguish two periods of Goethe's life, separated by the Italian travels (though the cause of the change commences, as we said, much earlier,) because we shall thereby be enabled to form a more correct judgment of his works and a truer understanding of his inner development. And at this point it ceases to be of interest to pursue the career of his external life, as we have done heretofore. The Weimar residence contains nothing beyond the connection with Frau von Stein and his subsequent marriage with Caroline Volpius, which might show external causes for the change in Goethe; and his Italian travels have but a few love-adventures which interfere with the externally even current of his life. On his return to Weimar the same quiet life is entered upon, which even the gigantic political and military enterprises of Napoleon can scarcely ruffle for a moment.

Only one important change it is of interest to note. In the first epoch of Goethe's life, we have found him possessed of the conviction, that his vocation was that of a painter or plastic artist. This conviction kept its hold upon Goethe's mind during the first ten years of his residence at Weimar, and it was chiefly to solve this great doubt of his life, that the Italian travels were undertaken. Hence we find him in Italy devoting almost exclusive attention to painting, modelling, &c.; for months he diligently occupied himself with *modelling a foot*. Only when he is on the point of leaving Italy, does he finally make up his mind that he is not to be a painter, but a poet, and that his future life shall be solely devoted to this grand vocation!

But alas! this resolution never bore fruit. On his return to Weimar we find him giving his mind another wrong direction, which

henceforth governed the rest of his life. He ceased to aspire to be a painter, but he again laid aside his holy vocation of a poet for an inclination for natural sciences. To some extent they had interested him all his life-time as became so ardent a lover of nature; and two important discoveries in these sciences had been made by him previous to his return from Italy. But they had, never so absorbed his attention and time as they now commenced to do, and although we estimate at their fullest value the *à priori* discoveries of Goethe on this field, we cannot but regret that the poet, who might have created a dramatic literature for Germany,* devoted his chief attention to a theory of colors which he might have employed any of his scientific friends to arrange and develop.

And now that we are about to take our leave of him, let us, in order to justify our view of the two epochs in Goethe's life, quote the chief works to which each epoch gave rise. The reader will see that nearly all the larger works, whereby the name of Goethe has become known to all the nations of the earth, were written in the first epoch, and many of the others were conceived before he went to Weimar.

FIRST EPOCH, 1766-1786.

Goetz.	Egmont.
Werther.	Proserpina.
Clavigo.	Faust, first part, and Helena of
Prometheus.	the second part.
Stella.	Tasso.
Kuenstlers Erdenwallen.	Die Voegel.
Erwin and Elmira.	Iphigenia.
Claudine von Villa Bella.	The first six books of Wilhelm
	Meister.

SECOND EPOCH, 1786-1832.

Roman Elegies.	Natural Daughter.
Metamorphosis of Plants.	Elective Affinities.
Venetian Epigrams.	Conclusion of Wilhelm Meister.
Optical Contributions.	Theory of Colors.
The Grand Cophta.	Truth and Poetry.
Reineke Fuchs.	Italian Travels.
German Emigrants.	West-Easterly Divan.

*The excuse, that there was no German nation for which to write, is paltry and absurd. Did Shakspeare write for the English nation? Nationality is finite and will always mar a product of art. No good work of art is national or was ever written for a nation. To be of permanent value it must be cosmopolitan.

The Tale.	Morphology.
Xenien.	Campaign in France.
Herrmann and Dorothea.	Meteorology.
Essay on Laokoon.	Second Part of Faust.

This classification, necessarily very imperfect, and comprehending only the more prominent of his writings, is sufficient to show that the second epoch of his life was singularly deficient in great poetical works. "Reineke Fuchs" and "Herrmann and Dorothea" are of course universally known and appreciated, as well for their artistic excellence as for their great poetic beauty; but even they are not of universal interest, as are and will be ever "Werther" and "Faust," "Egmont" and "Iphigenia"; and how very inferior is the rest of "Wilhelm Meister" to the first six books!

It would be pedantic to draw a historical line between all the productions of Goethe and separate them according to date; if this were our intention it were foolish. We have works quite as excellent in Goethe's second epoch as in his first; but a general comparison, which is all we mean to suggest, shows a deplorable change and falling off, such as we have seen the cause of in his life. It is only at the close of that life, as the purity of heaven again draws near and the simple faith of childhood again assumes its long lost supremacy, that we find a final and supernally magnificent illumination of Goethe's true genius. Then he becomes greater than he has ever been before, all the holy religious feelings return again and sway with wonderful force the estranged heart, which now, enriched with the experience and art of a lifetime, gives expression to the grandest and noblest utterances with unprecedented vigour. Its great final utterance occurs chiefly in the last few scenes of the Second Part of "Faust." The Faust of the First Part, who had become almost a stranger to us in the first parts of the Second Part, suddenly appears to us again, his well known form undetermined and vague in character as ever, to be sure, but with all the high longings and earnest thirst for truth, so magnificently portrayed in the First Part. We hear not only his burning thoughts again, but even the language and metre return to their original alternate beauty and Mephistophelean doggerel; nay the strains begin to sound similar, as if the same theme were taken up; the angels with their roses chant familiar melodies, and the rejuvenescence becomes perfectly clear when Gretchen, at the feet of the Mater Dolorosa, breaks out in the triumphant strain:

Neige, Neige,
Du Ohne gleiche,

Du Strahlenreiche
Dein Antlitz gnädig meinem Glück!

Der Früh Geliebte
Nicht mehr Betrübete
Er kommt zurück.

In the whole of Faust, there is nothing so exquisitely touching as the recurrence of this scene from the First Part, in all the higher glory and beauty which it obtains from the change of scenes. The sorely troubled Gretchen in earthly body, is now changed into a jubilant, triumphant soul, but as loving and charmingly *naïve* as ever, the figure of a Mater Dolorosa changed for the real Mater Dolorosa, the ruling queen of heaven.

The last strains of this immortal poem, powerful and religiously grand beyond expression, reconcile us fully again with the poet, and all the love and admiration which drew us towards him in the health and glow of his beauty and youth, re-awaken in view of the aged poet, who has shaken off the errors of manhood, and returned to the purity and health of his divine genius.

A. E. KROEGER.

THE THEOLOGICAL DEAD-LOCK.

FIFTY years ago Unitarianism was active, aggressive, and uncompromising. It asserted the Unity of God. It denied the Divinity of Christ. It rejected the Trinity. It repudiated Atonement for sin as immoral. It stigmatized Vicarious Suffering as unjust. It ignored Total Depravity as false. It made open war upon the evangelical system. Above all, it set aside the claims of Tradition, denied the efficacy of Faith, and asserted the supremacy of Reason and the Moral Sense.

Even now, after the lapse of half a century, we read the sermons of those old Iconoclasts, and feel the thrill of their impassioned rhetoric. True, they were not always consistent. They varied from each other in doctrines and details. They were not generally deep thinkers, and those who were such were fettered by the old routine. Science had not then opened her bible of stone. She had not yet spread before us her fossil plants and shells and bones, to prove by actual demonstration the absurdity of Genesis.

The doctrine that "in Adam's fall, we sinned all," had not yet been exploded by the evidence that imperfection, and suffering, and death, preceded the advent of man, and were ingrained in the very constitution of the Universe.

The Unitarians, in that intellectual Revival, differed and agreed to differ. They did not try to establish a standard of conformity. Far less did they seek to conceal their opinions. They did not stand on the defensive. They neither whined, nor canted, nor apologized. They did not seek admission into orthodox associations. They did better. They attacked orthodoxy in its very citadel of Puritan New England. Like Christ, they "came not to send peace, but a sword." How fiercely the battle raged ! In every congregation, in every family, in every pew, the struggle between Faith and Reason, between the dead letter and the living spirit, was fought out to the bitter end !

The result was division. Where orthodoxy had the majority, the heterodox sold out their pews and withdrew. Where heterodoxy prevailed, the orthodox sold out and departed. The lines were drawn, the issues were clear, and the result was unmistakable. The culture, and the intellect, and the moral power of New England pronounced with undoubted predominance in favor of the new reformation.

But while the educated and literary classes of New England thus vindicated their right to think and to reason, the less cultivated, but equally sincere, believers in the Puritan theology were roused into grim and terrible earnestness. To them, this freedom was sacrilege, this reform was apostacy, this reason was anti-Christ. Calvinism, to the common people of New England, was then, as it is now, the synonyme of Christianity. The verbal inspiration of every letter in the Bible was essential. To doubt it was infidelity, and to deny it was damnation. The physical resurrection of Jesus was their only hope of immortality. If there was no literal hell, there could be no actual heaven. The doctrine of the cross was the Alpha and Omega of their spiritual being.

Even the superficial success of the Unitarians gave potent weapons to the champions of reaction. That churches built by believers in a crucified redeemer should have been wrested from their children by "skeptics," seemed to them a monstrous injustice. How could they stand tamely by and see the monuments of ancient piety and self-denial perverted to the propagation of infidelity ? When Harvard University, highly endowed and historical, in part supported by the State, passed under the control of Latitudinarianism, it seemed like a combination of church and state against the most vital interests of religion.

There is an extraordinary fatality, by some called "God in History," which in every revolution brings to the head of affairs the natural leader. At this critical moment, by the same wonderful law which in 1776 gave us a Washington, and in 1860 a Lincoln, a representative man appeared in Boston and headed the popular movement. This man was Lyman Beecher.

Like all popular leaders he personified in a pre-eminent degree the mental peculiarities of his followers, and thus triumphed in virtue alike of his merits and defects. He was the very embodiment of the orthodox party of New England. In metaphysics he was weak; in philosophy, shallow; to accurate scholarship he made no pretensions. But his genius, exactly adapted to his work, surpassed scholarship and baffled calculation. He had the head of a statesman, the heart of a woman, and the soul of a saint. With absolute sincerity, intense enthusiasm, and heroic tenacity of purpose, he combined the driest humor, elastic cheerfulness, and shrewd, practical, Yankee common-sense.

Comprehending, as by instinct, the necessities of the situation, Dr. Beecher marshalled the evangelical forces upon a plan at once masterly and original. All minor sectarian differences were studiously postponed. Under an apparent liberality he concealed the real conservatism of his views. Rejecting infant damnation and those extreme, elaborate horrors which are the logical deductions from the premises, he yet accepted in the main the frightful theology of Jonathan Edwards. But with intuitive good sense he dwelt with special emphasis upon the exquisite character of Christ, the love of God, the redemption of sinners, and the reformation of society.

Under this vigorous leadership the sects united against their common enemy. Leaving to Unitarianism its claim of intellectual liberality, which to uncultured minds seemed cold and shadowy, they undermined it by taking the lead in every field of practical reform. Against intemperance, licentiousness and slavery "in the abstract," they lifted a voice of warning and rebuke. All the appliances of hope, and love, and terror, and superstition, were judiciously used to gather converts and multiply congregations. Modern machinery was invented to second the operations of the Holy Spirit. Sunday Schools stamped the popular theology upon the plastic minds of children. Revivals worked upon the imaginations of the more mature. Foreign and domestic missions were set on foot to effect the conversion of the world. Tract societies deluged the land with solemn inanities. Bible societies sent colporteurs to every farm and plantation. Colleges and seminaries under sectarian management, were endowed and filled

with students. These institutions annually sent out hundreds of half taught graduates as teachers and professors. They were just sufficiently intelligent to be bigoted, and yet sufficiently educated to become efficient leaders of a population too much absorbed in practical affairs to appreciate profound thought, or accurate scholarship.

Meanwhile, the Unitarians failed utterly to comprehend the tactics of their opponents. Demoralized by apparent victory, they incurred real defeat. They did not appreciate the duties and responsibilities of the hour. Instead of frankly admitting the radical incompatibility of a liberal theology with the evangelical system, they have tried for twenty-five years to conceal it both from themselves and others. They were denounced as Freethinkers. Instead of accepting the glorious epithet, they felt it a reproach. With nervous timidity they shrank from the imputation of infidelity. With fastidious aversion to controversy, they disclaimed all desire to make proselytes. They tried to gloss over the obnoxious peculiarities of their faith, instead of vindicating them and making them respected.

Then was seen the pitiful spectacle of Unitarian ministers trying to get a foothold in the great Orthodox organizations. They begged to be allowed to participate in Bible and tract societies, and to obtain recognition as fellow Christians from men to whom their rational opinions were utterly odious and abhorrent. Meanwhile the Orthodox world scarcely condescended to conceal its contempt.

In 1833, Theodore Frelinghuysen, the acknowledged Evangelical leader, and personally one of the most amiable of men, thus expressed the universal feeling: "There is not a Unitarian church in the country, in which you will not find a Bible on the desk, in which they do not read from its pages, in which they do not speak of God and of virtue with reverence and admiration; yet when questioned as to what they believe, you find that *they believe in nothing essential to Christianity*. When they reject the great doctrines of the divinity of the Saviour, the atonement and the inspiration of the Scriptures, what remains to be received or rejected?"

But when, in 1841, Theodore Parker set forth, in plain, honest English words, the very doctrines which twenty-five years before, the Unitarians had so triumphantly avowed, he found no enemies so bitter as the very men from whom he had drawn his inspiration, and whose sympathy he had a right to expect. Luther was not more distasteful to the dealers in Indulgencies than was (and is) an upright and downright speaker of the truth to ecclesiastical trimmers of his own denomination.

Fifteen years ago, two young Unitarian men of Cincinnati induced

Mr. Parker to lecture there, which he did with eminent ability and success. Of course, he was invited to preach in the Unitarian church. His first sermon caused a fluttering which would have been amusing if it had not been pitiful. Some of his audience actually left the church before the sermon was ended. And more than one Unitarian felt bound to anticipate Orthodox criticism by disavowing the doctrine, and denouncing the speaker in the Cincinnati newspapers.

But it would be useless to multiply illustrations of a fact patent to all. The Orthodox forms and phraseology are carefully imitated. Prayers and petitions are offered to God "in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." One may attend many Unitarian churches for months without hearing a word indicative of any departure from the standard of Orthodoxy. All is cold, formal, and decorous. But if, by accident, a sermon ever gets preached which has in it the old ring of Freedom and Progress, there is visible at once a feeling of indignation and disgust.

When a party is afraid or ashamed of its principles, it is already, to all practical purposes, dead! There are, indeed, among Unitarian ministers and congregations many noble exceptions. But, as a body, they no longer exert any wide or salutary influence. Unitarianism is no longer influential enough to be odious. It stands for no truth. It represents no idea. It arouses no enthusiasm. Every other sect grows with the nation's growth. The Unitarians grow not at all. In many States, not a single congregation. In many others, one or two feeble societies. Why is this? Methodists, Episcopalians, Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, Orthodox, Congregationalists, Universalists, add thousands every year to their numbers. Spiritualism spreads like Jonah's gourd. Even Mormonism sends its missionaries to Europe and the Sandwich Islands. Jews build their synagogues from Maine to Texas. Only Unitarianism languishes.

No form is too puerile to become the foundation of a sect; sprinkling or immersion; circumcision or holy water; the literal presence of God in a wafer, or of disembodied spirits in a table. Upon the trivial question whether the infant shall be sprinkled, or the child immersed, churches are built, newspapers printed, and thousands of men and women are ready to go to the stake. Nothing is too immoral to be justified; the celibacy of the clergy, the subjection of woman, the revival of polygamy, the practice of free love, all have open and zealous advocates. But the religion of Reason and Nature is neglected and despised!

Is it then human nature that has retrograded, or the church that has abdicated its mission? While science liberalizes even the Ortho-

dox world, and the secular spirit saps the foundations of the old theology, there is no such thing in America as a church of Progress, of Intellect, and of Ideas.

And the reason is perfectly obvious. Duplicity in action has arisen from duplicity in opinion and sentiment. For the past twenty-five years there has been a radical discrepancy in the views of Unitarians. Under the inevitable law of development, two distinct crystallizations have long since taken place. The Conservative party, a numerical majority, is timid, formal, sentimental, and fastidious. It is made up of Laodiceans, lukewarm and languid. It is of the world worldly, torpid and respectable, careful of appearances and averse to innovation. It loves, above all else, genteel, quiet elegance, and good taste. It is the apotheosis of well bred, polished religious indifference.

The Radical party is a minority of earnest men and women struggling to solve for themselves and others the great problems of life and destiny. They are positive in their convictions, fixed in their antagonism to the old tenets of historical Christianity, and desirous to wage open and deadly war with the popular theology.

These incongruous elements have been for a whole generation *in a theological dead-lock*. What the minority have lacked in wealth and numbers, they have made up in intellect and zeal. But it has been a marriage of incompatibilities. Like acid and alkali they have neutralized each other. Reversing the problem of perpetual motion, they have realized a surprising state of permanent inactivity.

There are noble men in the Unitarian body to-day, who heartily believe in the unity of God and the humanity of Jesus, in the supremacy of reason and the affirmations of the moral sense, in the law of development and the fact of progress. Moreover, they believe that religion has no necessary connection with theology, and is compatible with the widest diversity of belief.

So long as these men retain their connection with the fossil remains of a by-gone generation, they are like Sampson in the lap of Delilah. We cannot put new wine into old bottles. We cannot galvanize a corpse into life. If we would exert an influence upon the world, we must *stand for our Idea*. If truth and liberty are dear to our souls, we must offer them to others, and proclaim the gospel to those who sit in darkness. And if it be true that "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," it is equally true that those whom God hath put asunder, no man should any longer strive to unite.

HENRY B. BLACKWELL.

THE PILGRIM.

[From the German of Uhland.]

THE Pilgrim is moved by an impulse strong—
To the blessed city of God he goes;
To the blessed City of heavenly song,
That the Spirit to him with promise shows.

"Thou blissful stream! In thy mirror bright,
The Holiest thou wilt soon embrace;
Ye rocky cliffs! In the sunshine light,
Ye see even now, from afar, his face.

"And I hear the little bells ring clear—
And the evening-glow falls over all;
Oh, had I but wings, to fly from here,
Away over valley and rocky wall!"

He is drunken with rapture pure and high—
Languid with pain he bows his head,
And sleeping now on the flowers doth lie—
His thoughts to the City of God have fled.

"Too wide, too wide are these dreary spaces,
Too wide for the tortures of longing wild;
Ah, show me at last the longed-for places,
Bearing me upward, ye visions mild!"

Then opened the Heavens, and from on high,
A radiant angel, the answer gave—
"How can I to him the power deny,
To whom I the lofty longing gave!

"Longing and dreaming are pleasant ever—
Ever sweet to the heart of youth;
But nobler far is the brave endeavor,
That makes of the beautiful vision—Truth."

He fades away in the fragrant morning;
On marches the Pilgrim, strong once more,
Over hill, and valley, danger scorning,
And stands, at last, at the golden door.

And the City wide its portals flinging,
Like the arms of a mother, receives the Son;
While songs of heavenly joy are ringing
And the Pilgrim's course on earth is run.

A. T. W.

WHO IS OUR SAVIOUR ?

CHRISTIAN Theology answers, "Jesus Christ"; and says this answer is found in the Bible. Though the testimony of no book should be deemed sufficient for settling such a question, yet it may be interesting to inquire how far the popular answer is borne out by the use of the word Saviour among the Biblical writers. Many persons who have been educated in the nomenclature of the popular theology without much thought of its origin, if they should look into this matter, would doubtless be surprised to find how few times the name of Saviour is given to Jesus in the Bible — how few times, indeed, the word occurs there at all. The truth is, it was not till some time after most of the New Testament was written — that is, several generations after the life-time of Jesus and the first apostles — that the term Saviour came to be appropriated exclusively as a title of Jesus of Nazareth.

In the Old Testament the word *saviour* is used in its generic sense; never in the specific theological sense which has been given to it in Christian literature. It is applied to kings and great rulers, to successful generals, to men of remarkable wisdom and power, to any man who was instrumental in saving the Israelites from oppression, or in conquering their enemies, or in turning them from idolatry, and building them up as a people. Thus, Jehovah, it is said, raised up a Saviour to Israel in Othniel, who was both a judge and leader of armies; and again in Ehud, son of Serah, who overcome the Moabites and their king; and again in the king Joash, who went to war with the king of Syria, the oppressor of Israel, and three times conquered him, and recovered from his hands the cities which he had taken from the hands of the Israelites. We find the word also in the plural form; as, in recounting the mercies of Jehovah to Israel, it is said (Neh. ix. 27), He gave them saviours, who saved them from the hands of their enemies. Using the word precisely in the same sense, these old Hebrew writers would have called the Prince of Orange the saviour of Holland; William III. the saviour of England; George Washington, or Abraham Lincoln, or General Grant, the saviour of the United States of America.

But it is to be observed that in the Old Testament, particularly in the Prophets, the term saviour is applied also to God, and apparently with a caution against leaning too much on finite helpers, and forgetting the Supreme Source whence all help and salvation come — the Almighty One, who is Saviour above all saviours.

This was the primary office of the prophets, — to refer the people back of all intermediate, subordinate and finite agencies, to the supreme and overruling agency in all the affairs of men, — to lead them directly to God as Inspirer, Guide, Ruler, Judge, and Saviour.

Whereas the people, in their oppressions and distresses, were looking about for some finite, outward relief, now trying this leader and now that, now one remedy and now another, and seeking everywhere among human means — sometimes in foreign alliance, sometimes in a change of domestic policy — the one panacea for all their wants and woes, and waiting and praying for some great deliverer to come, the prophets cried in warning, "Seek not hither and thither; go not wandering over the earth for your help; these all are broken reeds to which you trust without the one Everlasting Refuge: Go to Jehovah, God of gods and King of Kings; you have disobeyed his commandments, but return unto him and he will have mercy; do justice and walk in His ways, and He will save you." It was in the spirit of such thoughts as these that we have the exclamation of the prophet Isaiah (xliii. 11), "Thus saith the Lord: I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour"; or of the prophet Hosea (xiii. 4), "Thou shalt know no God but me; for there is no Saviour besides me."

These examples will serve sufficiently to show the usage of the Old Testament with regard to the term *Saviour*: it is used never in a specific, theological sense, but always in its generic meaning of helper or deliverer; and it is applied, first to all persons who in the providence of God, were instrumental in bringing either physical deliverance or moral and spiritual help to the people of Israel; and secondly, it is applied to God as the supreme Helper and Deliverer above all. Whatever the Orthodox interpretation of the prophets may be, there is not a passage in the Old Testament where the term is used prophetically or symbolically of Jesus of Nazareth.

On turning to the New Testament, we should naturally expect, from the common use of the title, *Saviour*, in the Christian Church, to find a great increase in the use of it in this second part of the Bible. The contrary is the fact. In the first and second Gospels — the most valuable, as carrying us, probably, to the oldest sources of Christianity — the word *Saviour* does not occur at all, either as applied to Jesus, or to any one else. It is found but twice in Luke; once (i. 47), where it is used as a title of God; and once (ii. 11), it is used, *with the indefinite article*, of Jesus — where the sense is the same as in its generic application to human persons in the Old Testament. It occurs but once even in the 4th Gospel, though written

long a
prove
it is u
instan
in this
that c
Samar
twice
the in
leadin
cases
(Acts
more
ones.
teen t
Some
to Tit
and in
book
But
as ap
the p
parts,
four t
tamer
in the
all the
writte
centu
had o
the so
with
that i
inthia
Jame
of Jol
sians,
ring t
in all
Paul
which
Now

long after the death of Jesus, and with the distinct dogmatic purpose to prove him the Messiah and supernatural Son of God. In this instance it is used of Jesus and with the definite article: and this is the only instance in all the Gospels where Jesus is called "the Saviour"; and in this case, it is not the author of the Gospel or any of the disciples that call him so, but the title is put into the mouth of the heretic Samaritans. In the book of Acts, the term Saviour is found but twice—in both instances applied to Jesus, but in both instances with the indefinite article, and in precisely the sense in which it is used of leading providential men in the Old Testament. The words in both cases are, "Him hath God raised up to be a Saviour to Israel." (Acts v. 31; xiii. 23). When we come to the Epistles we meet the word more frequently, yet in them it is found only in the shorter and later ones. There are twenty-one epistles, but the word is found but nineteen times in them all, and is used indifferently of God and of Jesus. Sometimes the two uses occur in close juxtaposition; as in the epistle to Titus, 1st chapter, 3d verse, we have the phrase "God our Saviour," and in the very next verse the phrase, "Christ our Saviour." In the book of Revelation the word does not occur at all.

But not more noteworthy is the general absence of the term Saviour as applied to Jesus from the New Testament, than is its presence in the places where it is found. We have seen that in the historical parts, the four Gospels and the Acts, the title is applied to Jesus but four times, three times in the generic, common sense of the Old Testament, and once with the definite article; and this one instance is in the fourth Gospel. Now this Gospel in any event is the latest of all the historical portions of the New Testament—it having been written, if the disciple John was its author, near the end of the first century, but more probably (on the well sustained supposition that it had other authorship) not written till after one or more decades of the second century had passed. And when we come to discriminate with regard to the use of the term Saviour in the Epistles, we find that it does not occur in the epistles to the Romans, Galatians, Corinthians, Thessalonians, Colossians, Hebrews, nor in the epistle of James, and first of Peter. We find it but once in the three epistles of John, once in each of the epistles to the Philippians and Ephesians, and once in the epistle of Jude—in this latter instance referring to God; and finally, of the nineteen instances of its occurrence in all the epistles, fifteen are in the so-called Pastoral Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus and the second epistle of Peter—of which fifteen instances, ten are applications of the title to Jesus. Now it happens that these epistles—the epistles to Timothy and

Titus and the second of Peter — are, it cannot be said merely, of doubted genuineness, but of proved unguineness. Impartial and scholarly critics of all school, of theology, conservative and radical have come to the conclusion that these epistles are not the productions of the apostles Paul and Peter, but have their authorship in the second century. And further, it happens that each of the other epistles in which the word Saviour is applied to Jesus, is also under doubts as to its apostolic origin, though the doubts are not so well substantiated as with regard to those just mentioned.

We have, therefore, these very remarkable facts : in none of the earlier, longer, and more important epistles is the title of Saviour given to Jesus ; in no one of the epistles attributed to Paul, that are of undoubted genuineness, do we find that title ; in none of the epistles that are of undoubted apostolic origin, or that belong, beyond question, to apostolic times, do we find it. And putting these facts alongside of what we learned concerning the use of the term by the writers of the gospels, we discover that the nearer we get to the age of the first apostles and to their unquestioned productions, the nearer we get to the time of Jesus himself and to the original sources of Christian history and doctrine, the less frequently do we meet the term Saviour applied to Jesus. In Matthew, in Mark, in Luke, in the Acts, in the Apocalypse, in the great and unquestioned epistles of Paul — that is, in all the writings which, either by original authorship or literary tradition, carry us back to the first apostolic age — the name of Saviour is seldom given to Jesus, and never in any other than that generic sense of helper and deliverer in which it is applied to human persons of beneficent power in the Old Testament ; when used at all, it is with the indefinite article. When we come to the fourth gospel, near the end of the first century, or, more probably, in the second — at least two generations after the death of Jesus — we find him once called *the* Saviour. But not till we come to writings which learned and critical students place near the middle of the second century, do we find the name Saviour given to him as a frequent and familiar title. And even in these writings, with one exception, it is not attributed to him so commonly and exclusively as it is in Christian usage now ; the title is still used, even in these late and unapostolic epistles of God. But the distinction between Jesus as *a* Saviour, and God as *the* Saviour supreme over all, begins to be lost sight of ; and in the second epistle attributed to Peter, which is the exception just mentioned, and which is in all probability the *latest* writing of the New Testament, we find the title given to Jesus only.

And at this period — to state one further curious fact — we meet

for the first time in Christian literature that phrase, the proper repetition of which is now considered in many quarters as the test of Christian Orthodoxy, "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And where do we find it? Not in Paul, not in Peter, not in Matthew or John, not in any teaching of Jesus concerning himself, not in any writing by any apostle of Jesus, or by any companion of an apostle, or by any one belonging to the apostolic age; but we find it, and we find it only, in this second epistle called Peter's, whose genuineness has been more generally doubted than that of any other New Testament writing; which has not a shred of evidence to carry its authorship back beyond the last quarter of the second century; which was suspected of being spurious by many of the Church Fathers, before biblical criticism had become a science; which was with difficulty admitted into the received canon that was closed by ecclesiastical authority, and which has always held a sort of outside place as one of the doubtful epistles to be read by way of exhortation, but not to be accepted as doctrinal authority, and which all scholarly theologians, since the days of criticism began, Erasmus and Calvin among them, have rejected as unguine. Yes, strange as the fact may seem, this phrase, "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," which modern Orthodoxy makes the Shibboleth of Christianity, and which many Unitarian divines, as if in emulation of the unctuous tones of Orthodoxy, are notably fond of using, and which has been placed with scrupulous theological care in the constitutions of some of the Local Unitarian Conferences recently formed, occurs in the New Testament in that single epistle whose genuineness even Calvin denied!

Curiously enough, therefore, those who decline to apply the word Saviour as a common and exclusive title to Jesus, and who for this omission are sometimes charged with being unevangelical and unchristian, may claim that their practice in this respect is more in accordance with the primitive usage of the apostolic church than is that of their opponents. In original Scriptural phrase, they say of Jesus, that, in the line of human progress, he was "*a* Saviour." They acknowledge with reverent and grateful appreciation the life-giving truth, the uplifting inspiration, the ministering, healing love, the higher ideal of human character, and the strengthening example of human virtue and holiness, that have come into the world from the life of the prophet of Galilee, to be for the personal redemption and health of many souls. But as an exclusive and absolute title, when it comes to that, they must, in protest against the common usage of the Christian church, reserve this most amiable and compassionate of all names for One who is supreme over all finite and human instru-

mentalities, who is at once infinite in power and wisdom and goodness, who is of tenderer love than even human father or mother, who is himself the outgoing word of incarnation, the source of all truth and tenderness and pity, and who is nearer to us than any incarnated person, however great and powerful, can possibly be. *God is our Saviour.* We can have no greater; we can be satisfied with no less. Jesus was one of His instruments, through which he has sent moral healing and salvation into the world, one of His forms of incarnation; but not the first nor the last. He showed the way in which the Father saves; showed the *way*, but did not make himself the *end*. He points us *to*, but also leaves us *with* the Father, staying not himself to occupy any precious space between our emptiness yearning to be filled, and the fulness of God's infinite love yearning to impart.

W. J. POTTER.

THE ODIUM THEOLOGICUM.

"UNFORTUNATELY, metaphysics in this country seem to have lapsed into a chronic state of litigation. It is the disease of a free country that party possesses everything. Pure science, even, has a difficulty in keeping itself out of the contagion. But the scientific handling of a moral or theological topic is a procedure wholly inconceivable to the public." This is said by an English critic, of the state of philosophical and religious discussion in his own country; what shall we say of it among ourselves? Certainly, not that it has "lapsed" into this condition, for it has never been out of it; nor that the scientific method of discussion upon such topics is "inconceivable to the public" merely, for it seems to be equally inconceivable to all. The number of those who can have opinions and defend them without dogmatism, and who can controvert the opinions of others, without invoking a theological odium against them, is infinitesimally small.

Within the domain of avowed Orthodoxy, this is a matter of course. It does not acknowledge any other method in the pursuit of truth, and it does not need any other argument for the refutation of error. Indeed, dogmatism and the *odium theologicum* might be taken as a compendious definition of genuine Orthodoxy.

With the Liberal school the case is, or ought to be, otherwise. Liberalism upon Orthodox principles seems to be almost without mean-

ing. Orthodox Liberalism ! Is it not a contradiction in terms ? Is it not much like a "round square" — involving a kindred difficulty ? In the one case, the difficulty, according to Mr. Mill, "that in our uniform experience, at the instant when a thing begins to be round it ceases to be square" ; and in the other, the corresponding difficulty that "in our uniform experience at the instant" a person begins to be *Orthodox* he ceases to be *Liberal* ?

Orthodoxy and Liberalism are two magnets with different polarities. The Orthodox needle, theoretically at least, points towards a constant pole, without "variableness or shadow of turning," having neither "dip" nor "declination," being wholly unsusceptible to any changes in the atmospheric conditions of thought, or the magnetic current of feeling. The Liberal needle, on the contrary, theoretically (it is equally necessary to say), though always electrified, is determined to no absolutely constant pole in the heavens of thought, but delicately sensitive to every change in its magnetic conditions, is free to "dip" through the entire circle of the meridian, and to embrace all points of the horizon in the possibilities of its "declination." The one is a fixture, and hence a system. The other is moveable, and hence, at best, only a movement. The system and the movement proceed upon fundamentally different assumptions. Orthodoxy assumes that by virtue of Intuition or Revelation, human opinions may attain, and in certain well-known instances have long ago attained, the character of final truth — that absolute truth may, and indeed has here and there become *actual* truth. Liberalism, on the contrary, assumes that by virtue of the necessary dependence of human opinions upon human conditions, and the actual instability of those conditions, all such opinions must be accepted as only provisional truth — that absolute truth is not, and cannot be *actual*, but only *ideal* truth.

While therefore we expect the Orthodox to adopt the methods of the partizan in the interest of what he calls "the truth," we are not prepared to find the Liberal proceeding in the same manner. We are not surprised, indeed, if in his attempt to enforce upon the hearts and consciences of men, the convictions of their own intellects, and so to induce them to be true to themselves, he makes use of the entire armory of persuasion and appeal, rebuke and denunciation, but we are not prepared to find him using these instruments to enforce his own convictions upon their hearts or their intellects.

But it is not thus that our current Liberalism understands itself. It patronizes, and it disparages ; it declaims, and it damns ; with as much apparent relish as the most consistent Orthodoxy. And this is because, like Orthodoxy, it is still partizan. It has as yet advanced

only so far as this : it leaves one party because it is narrow, and joins another because it is more roomy. It does not, indeed, unite with Romanism against the rest of the universe, including Astronomy and Geology ; nor with *New** Unitarianism, whatever that may be, against the schools of Channing and Parker ; but it does unite with Intuitionism, Spiritualism (Anti-Materialism), and Theism against supernaturalism and Judaistic Christianity, on the one hand, and Positivism, Materialism, and Atheism on the other.

In relation to the speculations of these bolder philosophies, it was an instance of most unexampled liberality to utter such words as the following : "The common bond must be a common spirit and aim, a common faith in humanity, and its divine (ideal *human*?) destination, a common aspiration towards higher good and vaster verities. Whoever feels the upward influence of this spirit, faith and aspiration, I hail as my brother by a closer tie than that of blood. Let him believe what he may, let him even be groping in the moral (intellectual?) midnight of utter Atheism, &c." (*Rad.* Dec. 1866, p. 225). We will not suppose that the writer of this passage suspected himself of doing a generous thing in uttering these words of hearty welcome ; for this would be to despoil them of all their genuineness. Undoubtedly, the writer did not aim to be *generous*, but to be *just*.

It is, however, we believe, an occasion for profound regret, that no better term than "*moral* midnight" was at the writer's disposal, by which to characterize that integrity in the inward parts, which leads a man honestly to face the most unwelcome conclusions of his intellect, however cherished idols may totter or fall, and truthfully to speak what he thinks, without reservation or subterfuge, whatever it may cost him, in honorable surroundings or profitable places. Nevertheless, the *intention* of the passage to be just, is not doubtful.

But we are not so certain of the following : "There is no greater honor than to train as a soldier of the Spiritualism which resists and assails the muddy theory that the soul is but an accident of the organism, and that the universe stops bolt upright in our poor mortality with *all* below us, and nothing but blank beyond. Against the conclusions of the cold understanding — interpose — our enthusiasm as a fact." (*Rad.* Jan. 1867, p. 293). An enthusiasm not for the un-

* "Neither the Unitarians nor the Trinitarians have gained a complete victory. Each has taken some important position and yielded some other. We have a book called, "Concessions of Trinitarians" ; another might be written containing the "Concessions of Unitarians." (*Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy*, p. 17.) We strongly suspect we are quoting from one or the other of these books.

biased pursuit of truth, but for the propagation of a dogma is a par-tizan enthusiasm, that is to say, a frenzied prejudice.

But why is it not a greater honor to train as modest inquirers into the truth or falsity of this spiritualism and of immortality, than as the champions of these dogmas? Is it because their truth or falsity is no longer in question? Perhaps so, if it be true, as a recent writer would lead us to infer, that the only "open questions in Theology," at present, are "the doctrines of the Trinity, and Incarnation, Original Sin, Total Depravity, Salvation by Christ, Regeneration," the questions raised by the Tübingen critics, that of "the distinction between the natural and the supernatural," and most fundamental of all, the question, "how do we *know* the existence of soul, duty, and immortality." (*Chr. Exam.* Jan. 1866, pp. 77, 90).

But are there really no other open questions? Is not the question of the *soul* open? M. Taine says not. Why? Because "the problem of the soul, in the present state of science, is a premature problem." M. Scherer pronounces that "spiritualism a little superanated" which "makes the soul and body independent forces, and susceptible of being disunited." The question of the soul is then by no means a closed one. Indeed the *tendency* undoubtedly is to "close" it in the negative. Says M. Janet: "It is useless to conceal it, for ten or fifteen years the spiritualistic school has been suffering a check of the most grave character." "Spiritualism is not in a position to make conquests." Formerly it was more aggressive than defensive; the contrary is true to-day." "In England," says Mr. Lecky, "the philosophy of experience, pushed to the extreme of Hume, and represented by the ablest living philosopher of Europe, has been rising with startling rapidity to authority, and has now almost acquired an ascendancy in speculation. In France, the reaction against spiritualism, and the tendency towards avowed materialism, as represented by the writings of Comte, of Renan, and of Taine, are scarcely less powerful than at the close of the last century; while, under the guidance of Schopenhauer and of Buchner, even Germany itself, so long the chosen seat of metaphysics, is advancing with no faltering steps in the same career." Whether, therefore, the question of a soul separable from its material accompaniment, be an open one or not, it is one manifestly in controversy, and also one apparently in eminent peril; and are the questions of Immortality and of the Existence of God, at present, in much better condition? It is not wise, or it is not honest to disguise the fact. These questions, usually supposed to belong to Theology, are to-day wide open. They are doubtful questions. Men of apparently equal culture, equal honesty, equal

delicacy of perception and feeling, come to very different conclusions. Those who have an equal right to be heard and to vote, are divided; and unfortunately for the traditional dogmas, the vote is not a "tie." Undoubtedly the situation is unpleasant. Undoubtedly it is difficult to allow that our opponents upon such vitally important questions, may after all, be as large-minded, as logical, and as penetrating as ourselves. But yet it may be true.

In the midst of this intellectual uncertainty, in which, then, we must confess we find ourselves, it may perhaps be a consolation to reflect, that in matters of *religion proper* — of religion distinguished from Theology, and understood to mean, not a certain set of Orthodox opinions, but a certain *purity* of the affections, and a certain *righteousness* of the will, there is among the representatives of all sects and schools, a substantial agreement. All men understand what the furniture of a good "heart" consists of; but nobody can determine what, at present, ought to be the contents of a good "head."

This being the situation, what course should a genuine and faithful Liberalism pursue in the present?

First of all, it seems to us, it ought not to embarrass the solution of any intellectual problem by invoking a religious or moral pre-judgment to take sides in the matter, whether the question in debate belong to Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, or Psychology. Least of all, if it belong to the difficult region of Ontology. Thus it may possibly save timid people from becoming unthinking machines, and bold ones from becoming unscrupulous hypocrites. In the second place, we believe it ought to go further, and both welcome and encourage the most exhaustive researches, and the boldest speculations in every field of inquiry, whether old or new, having the courage to ask no pledges beforehand, as to their tendencies, and guaranteeing that no menace, like a pillar of cloud or fire, shall hang over their results.

In this way, if it have not itself lost all faith in a God and a Providence, (a faith which perhaps it would like to share with others); if it have not come to distrust the prophecies of the mustard-seed, and the leaven, and turned infidel to the law of progress in the face of all history, it may confidently hope to see its truth, if it have any, abundantly confirmed, and, if perchance it lose any cherished errors, not to lose them without recompense.

S. C. BEACH.

WHAT, AND HOW?

EACH of us has a religious belief, either written or unwritten ; that is, each of us has a creed. This belief contains certain ideas, — doctrines if you will, — concerning man and God, and the relations between man and God. Now it is this belief concerning man and God that is the inspirer of religious work for our own spiritual growth, and for the good of our fellow men. As is our belief, so, in great measure, will be our work. The Calvinist believes that all men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, and this belief inspires his methods of work, in most of which it would be impossible for a Liberal Christian to join him. The belief of the Liberal Christian in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man leads him to certain work in which the Calvinist could not join. There are kinds of work in which all denominations can heartily co-operate, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and relieving the sick ; but it is only in so far as their religious beliefs, and the impulses of humanity move them to this common work that they are able to labor together. As soon as their beliefs prompt to different methods of work, they must separate, although the ultimate end for which each is striving may be the same. A common end is not sufficient basis for organization ; there must also be agreement as to the means of attaining that end.

This agreement as to the work to be done is perhaps the most essential element for the harmonious working of any organization. Men sometimes work together when the ends they have in view are different. If they can agree as to the thing to be done, they do that thing, each one considering himself irresponsible for the motives which impel the others. On the other hand, men who have a common end are often widely separated in their sympathies and work, for their ideas of what constitutes that end, and their modes of attaining it, may be widely different, and often are so. Perhaps if we go to the fundamental aim of religious denominations we shall find that in nearly all of them it is to do good to man, to promote "the highest development of the individual," but what this highest development is, and how it is best promoted, are subjects upon which the denominations do not agree, hence they work in different ways.

Men may organize for mutual aid in the investigation of truth. Such an organization would seem to require the very minimum of belief, yet even here there must be belief in honest and thorough investigation ; a belief which will lead to toleration of the views to

which such investigations lead. An organization may be made for the purpose of doing work ; either secular work, to further worldly interests ; or religious work, to do good to men. Before such an organization can be made there must be an agreement as to certain things on the part of those who enter it. If it is an organization to do good to men there must be an agreement as to *what* it is good to do for men, and as to *how* this good is to be done. This what-to-do, and how-to-do, depend mainly on the theological beliefs of men, hence the ultimate basis of the organization is the belief, faith, creed of those who enter into it. Only in so far as men believe that certain things are good, and are agreed as to the methods of accomplishing those things, can they organize for practical work.

Mr. Abbott, in the December *Radical*, says that "the National Unitarian Conference disappointed the hopes of all those who look deeper than any possible creed for the true basis of religious organization," but as a religious organization is for the purpose of work, and as the work which each man is willing to do is inspired by his religious belief, and as this belief, whether it be unexpressed, or spoken, or written, is in effect and creed, it is difficult to see how we are to look deeper than any *possible* creed for the basis of organization. The cry against creeds is to a great extent a baseless one, and is so conducted that there is good evidence that those who make it have as strong a creed as those whom they decry. To say that you are creedless, is to say that you are faithless ; that you believe neither in God nor man, neither in Truth nor Justice, neither in Love nor Mercy. All men have creeds. Why not acknowledge it at once, cease this vague clamor, and turn our attention to the important question, what creed shall we hold and teach ?

Mr. Abbott gives a sketch of a constitution for the organization of Radicals, the preamble to which says, "the only bond of union elastic enough to leave free play for individual growth, must be a platform of principles that are laws of life, of purposes and ends ; that are life itself." True, O most worthy Oracle ! Never gave Delphic Pythia a surer sound ! But what are those principles ? what are those purposes and ends ? how shall they be attained ? When these questions are answered, will not this elastic bond of union prove but a rope of sand ? Radicals are not wont to be cordially agreed concerning these things. Again, Mr. Abbott says, "the grand end of human society is the freest, fullest, and highest development of the individual," and "the grand end of the individual soul is the realization in itself, and in the world, of the highest Ideal of Humanity." Yea, verily. Come Pagan, Mohammedan, Jew and Christian in grand

proces
names
away,
of the
we wo
tions,
when
homev
ideas
Ideal
ideas
not ye

Mr.
tails"
them,
"Free
meda
find t
shut c

Mr.
dwell
which
men,
led, b
nest
certa
help
and l

T

V
that
dict
fact
rule

procession from the remotest corners of the earth, subscribe your names, and sing pæan ; but when your shouts of rejoicing have died away, ask Mr. Abbott what is the freest, fullest, highest development of the individual ? what is the highest Ideal of Humanity ? how shall we work to bring these to pass ? When he has answered these questions, when he has given form and shape to his glittering generalities, when he has thus stated his creed, you can betake yourselves to the homeward path, sadder and wiser men, convinced that Mr. Abbott's ideas of the fullest development of the individual and of the highest Ideal of Humanity, and his methods of attaining these are not your ideas and methods. You will be convinced that the millenium has not yet come.

Mr. Abbott need give himself no trouble about those "minor details" which "could be easily arranged." He will have no use for them, unless, indeed, it be to "associate" himself into an Orthodox "Free Brotherhood," from fellowship in which the "Catholic, Mohammedan, Mormon" who are "drawn to him by secret affinities," will find themselves as effectually shut out as he now considers himself shut out of fellowship in Orthodox Unitarianism.

Mr. Abbot's constitution may answer for a council of the gods who dwell high up on the Olympus of that Radicalism, the chief duty of which is to celebrate itself, but for mortals living among their fellow men, seeing the ignorance and wickedness out of which they must be led, believing that they can be led only by human sympathy and earnest work, knowing that that work must be prompted by firm faith in certain definite things which are good for men, feeling the need of help in discerning what these things are and how they are to be done, and longing for hope and comfort in their work, will each exclaim :

"Defend me, therefore, common sense, say I,
From reveries so airy."

OSCAR CLUTE.

THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY FOR THE BIBLE.

WE are met everywhere by an assumption, confidently made by the clergy, and implicitly believed by the mass of the people, that the Bible, throughout, is the Word of God ; written from His dictation, miraculously preserved by Him from all error, whether of fact or doctrine, and given by Him as the one infallible and sufficient rule for human guidance.

The assumption thus confidently stated is not only an utterly unproved hypothesis, but the very term with which it commences makes a false and delusive implication. "*The Bible.*" As if the Bible were one thing, instead of a collection of many things! As if its contents were uniform instead of heterogeneous in character. As if it were even one book, instead of two collections of books! As if it contained one religion only, instead of two diverse, and in some points diametrically opposite, systems of religion!

PRELIMINARY VIEW.

Come with me, reader, to a great public library. In one of its alcoves, let us say Alcove G, there are collected the works of fifty or sixty authors, persons of the most various talents and conditions in life, who wrote in different languages, and on a vast variety of subjects, at times extending over a period of fifteen or sixteen centuries. These books contain History, Poetry, Fables, Tales, Sermons, Songs, Dreams, Voyages and Travels, Philosophy, Satire, Dramatic and Didactic compositions, and Records of Religious Systems, battles and wars, crimes and punishments. It appears that you have read some of these books, and superficially glanced over others. Now I seriously ask — Do you believe in the contents of Alcove G, as absolutely true, and infallibly correct in every particular?

What a question! Before you can answer it intelligently, you must have read all these books, and learned something of their authorship, and of the various periods in which they were written; and you must have carefully compared them, to find whether their statements are probable and reasonable, whether they agree with other testimony, and whether they agree together. Very few persons are competent to give an affirmative answer to such an inquiry, even after careful examination.

But suppose you make the requisite examination, and find among these writers not only much that is good and true, but various irreconcilable discrepancies and contradictions, and some unreasonable and repulsive doctrines, combined with statements which the progress of science has shown to be incorrect. Will it then be possible for you to answer the question affirmatively?

Suppose, in addition, that your examination reveals the fact that two opposing systems of religion are contained there, one setting forth the doctrines of the Mohammedans, and the other the adverse tenets of the Fire-Worshippers. Will not this state of things absolutely prevent your saying that you believe in all the tenets of Alcove G, as absolutely true?

It is not at all uncommon to hear the question asked — Do you believe the Bible? or to hear the confident assumption made — Of course you believe the Bible! And the answer to this question or this assumption generally expresses a perfect conviction of the truth and correctness of everything contained in that book. Not one in a hundred of those who make this answer have the faintest conception of the amount of knowledge required to express any intelligent opinion upon the subject. Not one in a hundred of them understands that the question which they presume so hastily to settle includes all the difficulties and uncertainties of the question about Alcove G.

But if you consider (making the laborious investigations indisputably necessary) when and by whom the various works constituting the Old Testament were written, when and by whom they were collected, when and by whom the various memoirs, narratives and letters constituting the New Testament were written, and when and by whom *they* were collected, when and by whom the two collections thus existing were bound together in one volume, and, finally, when and by whom the hypothesis was invented that these two diverse collections of writings constitute one infallible rule obligatory upon Christians, you will find many difficulties in the way of honestly saying you believe all the statements therein contained. What *right* have you thus to believe, without more evidence than you possess upon the subject?

If you further take note of many positive and irreconcilable discrepancies, between different authors and different parts of the same author, in the books in question, it will appear not difficult merely, but impossible, to accept all of them as true.

If you further observe that the two principal parts which have been strangely brought together to constitute this one book, called the Bible, are the history, records and laws of two antagonistic religions, a still further difficulty will present itself in the way of receiving both as true.

FACTS IN REGARD TO THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES.

The Old Testament consists of the history, records and laws of the Jewish religion, an antiquated and obsolete system, which, though greatly in advance of the heathenism that preceded it four thousand years ago, is so clearly understood to be at variance with Christianity, that missionaries are sent to the Jews, just as to the various sorts of heathen, and the desire of Christendom is to convert them from Judaism, just as much as to convert the Hindoos, the Turks, or the Chinese, from the false systems of religion which they follow. To

persist in being a Jew is to refuse to be a Christian. The Jew who becomes a Christian is cursed, hated and renounced by his Jewish brethren. He is contemptuously and opprobriously "Cast out of the synagogue." Is it not folly, then, as well as falsehood, to try to represent the synagogue and the Christian church as belonging to the same system? To bind up in one volume the book of laws which has given the Jew his Jewish peculiarities, and that very different book of laws which has given the Christian his Christian peculiarities, and say that these two constitute one perfect and infallible rule, absolutely binding upon every Christian? Taking these things into consideration, an intelligent acceptance of both these systems as constituting one rule for the present time will appear absurd as well as impossible.

There is much uncertainty respecting the date, and much respecting the authorship of the various books constituting the Hebrew Scriptures, commonly called the Old Testament. A large number of them give no account whatever of their own authorship. Not one of those books *declares itself* to be written by any particular person until we come to Nehemiah. The ordinary belief in regard to the authorship of these anonymous works is founded mainly on so very uncertain a thing as Jewish tradition; and, in cases where modern science has carefully applied itself to the examination of evidence (as in regard to the Pentateuch, assumed by the Jews to be the work of Moses,) the weight of testimony contradicts, instead of supporting, the assumption. The dates at which the five books composing the Pentateuch were written are absolutely unknown, and there is much doubt respecting even the century, or the general period of Jewish history, in which they were composed. The researches of the most competent and trustworthy critics make it probable that they were written by several unknown persons, and at various periods, and that they were not collected in their present form till several hundred years later than the time ordinarily assumed for them. But whoever undertakes to look at this evidence for himself, trying to get as near as possible to the original sources of information, and to find the reasons of the different views taken by different persons, will be likely to find himself first puzzled by the slight amount of evidence and the wide range of conjecture, and next amazed at the hardihood of the manufacturers of those accurate chronological tables of the whole field of Scripture history which decorate the margins of so many of our Bibles.

FACTS IN REGARD TO THE CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES.

The New Testament contains four biographical sketches of the

found
of the
specia
relatin

The
respec
ably v
were
author
to hav
after t
tween
from t

Jesu
seem t
the de
to und
ideas
repres
blindn
many
ability
as they
his life
Jesus
admir
lapse o
to have
ory thi
some o
have e
truths
Jesus is
him, sin
previou
compet
incorec
of that
that th
memory
bility to
cermme

founder of Christianity, Jesus of Nazareth, called Christ ; a narrative of the proceedings, after his death, of the twelve men whom he specially commissioned to publish his doctrine ; and sundry letters, relating to that doctrine, written by several of his early followers.

There is much uncertainty respecting the authorship, and much respecting the date, of these documents. Most of them were probably written by the persons whose names they bear, and all, no doubt, were written according to the best of the knowledge and belief of the authors. The biographical sketches (called Gospels), are supposed to have been written at periods varying from eight to seventy years after the death of Jesus ; the Acts of the Apostles somewhere between thirty-five and sixty years after that event ; and the Epistles from twenty-five to seventy years after it.

Jesus himself left no writings whatever, and none of his disciples seem to have been able to comprehend his character, or to fathom the depth of his thought. They often, by their own admission, failed to understand his words ; and they often, no doubt, formed erroneous ideas respecting them, without becoming aware of their error. He is represented as repeatedly complaining of their slowness, dulness, and blindness, and he declared himself unable to communicate to them many things that he desired to make known, on account of their inability to understand them. From these men, however, incompetent as they were, proceeded the only records that undertake to describe his life, his teachings, and his death. All our means of knowing what Jesus said, did, and meant, are comprised in the record of four admiring but confessedly incompetent followers, writing down, after a lapse of many years, their recollections of what they understood him to have said, done, and meant. Even thus, writing down from memory things which they often failed to understand, they have given us some of the noblest traits and some of the grandest thoughts that have ever appeared in any human being. The great and majestic truths respecting the Heavenly Father and his relation to man, which Jesus is represented to have uttered, may be confidently attributed to him, since they are collectively above and beyond the scope of any previously existing religion, and since the writers are manifestly incompetent to have framed them. On the other hand, when we find incorrect statements or objectionable sentiments put into the mouth of that venerable personage, it is just and reasonable to remember that the error *may* have sprung from a failure of discernment or memory in the historian. Of course, the man Jesus had a human liability to error ; but the lower grade of intelligence and spiritual discernment among his disciples, combined with the length of time

which elapsed before their recollections were written down, give plausible grounds for referring any alleged error to them rather than to him.

REASONS AGAINST THE CLERICAL THEORY.

It may be well to state here the reasons for not accepting the clerical hypothesis of an infallible inspiration of every part of the Old and New Testaments.

1. The assumption of such inspiration remains merely a hypothesis, never having been proved.

2. The numerous books, small and great, which pretend to afford such proof, not only fail to give it, but show plainly the attempt to deceive in regard to it. They often assume, and sometimes declare, things grossly false, and they abound in deceptive implication, unsound premises, unauthorized conclusions, and dishonest reference to passages of Scripture.

3. The very numerous discrepancies and contradictions existing between the works that have been brought together under the name of "The Bible," (quite natural and harmless in view of their diverse human origin,) absolutely forbid the theory that God dictated those writings, or that he prevented the admixture of error with them.

4. The low and unworthy views of God, and of his relations with man, presented by many of these writers (quite natural, considering the limited intelligence and imperfect culture of the age in which they lived), absolutely forbid the theory that God himself dictated, inspired, or miraculously superintended their record.

When the question is asked, "Do you believe the Bible?" (by which the clerical inquirer means — Do you believe our hypothesis of the infallible inspiration of all the books in the Old and New Testaments?) — it is sufficient to reply with the counter question — "What reason is there for believing it?" Let him who wishes to maintain this hypothesis produce his evidence; and let the hearer of it mark on the spot such points of it as he shall find unfounded, erroneous, or inconclusive, and point out these defects to his exhorter.

DISHONEST METHOD OF MAINTAINING THAT THEORY.

He who declines to admit the claim of infallible inspiration for the Bible will probably be accused of "throwing away the Bible." He who specifies the errors or contradictory passages of the book as rebutting evidence, showing that it cannot have sprung entirely from God's dictation, will probably be accused of "denouncing the Bible." In such cases the accused should bear in mind, and should plainly de-

clare to the accuser, that the thing "thrown away," the thing "denounced," is not the Bible, but a certain unproved hypothesis concerning that book. Let the asserters of this doctrine *prove* it instead of urging further their unreasonable demand that it be taken on trust by the community.

When the writings of men of different ages of the world, different religions, different characters, ideas and purposes, and different grades of intelligence and civilization are bound together in one volume, it is a matter of course that errors and discrepancies will be found in that volume. These do not in the least impugn the character of the book. Of itself, it does not pretend to be anything but a collection of diverse writings, the several parts of which are to be judged each by its own evidence. If anybody sets up a claim that the whole and every part are absolutely free from error, it is for him to prove that claim. Such proof has never been given in regard to the sixty-six books contained in the Old and New Testaments, though it has often been pretended. The great number of incorrect assumptions and erroneous statements which are found in every book and every tract pretending to prove the inspiration of the Bible make it necessary to scrutinize carefully the accuracy of every portion of such pretended proof. Especially is such care necessary in dealing with the tracts or books prepared by the American Tract Society. The systematic dishonesty of the managers of that body has been so thoroughly proved by their dealings in regard to slavery, that no statement of theirs should be received without the corroborative evidence of persons known to be truthful. Every one may assure himself of their fraudulent dealing in regard to the claim of infallible inspiration for the whole Bible, by turning, in any one of their publications upon that subject, to their Scriptural quotations in support of it, examining the connection and meaning of each in its place in the Bible, and noticing how many of them are so *utterly* destitute of pertinence or appropriateness as plainly to appear intentionally deceptive.

The basis of that superstructure of sophistry and fraud which is found in the books that pretend to prove infallible inspiration for the Bible is the claim that the Bible itself assumes its own inspiration. Their array of pretended argument and pretended evidence is offered in corroboration of a claim assumed to be made by the book itself. How entirely this assumption falsifies the fact, how entirely "of whole cloth" this pretence is made up, may be seen in ten minutes by any one who will take the Bible, look at the opening of each book, and see whether or not they *claim* to be from God, or infallibly inspired, or to have any other origin or cause than other books have, namely,

the choice of some man to write each one of them. He who makes such an examination will find these three things, namely : —

I. Neither the volume called the Bible, nor either of the two collections of books that compose it, *claims for itself* to be infallibly inspired. No such claim can be found made either by the Old Testament for itself, or by the New Testament for itself, or by either for both.

II. A separate examination of each of the sixty-six works which have been brought together to form this volume will show that they make not even any individual claim to be infallibly inspired ; and that not one in ten of them uses any language bearing even a slight resemblance to such a claim.

III. In regard to the few exceptional cases, namely, the books ascribed to "Hosea," "Joel," "Micah," "Zephaniah," and "Malachi," in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the book called "Revelation," in the Christian Scriptures, even if their opening expressions *may* mean that God dictated their contents, those expressions do not *require* that interpretation ; since they may mean just as really (and much more probably) only what a minister means who says to his people — "God commands you" to lead honest lives. And even should it be judged upon this evidence that these six books *were* infallibly inspired, this would not establish, nor *tend* to establish, a similar claim in behalf of the sixty others.

We are to wait, then, for evidence, before admitting the assumption, either that the Bible *claims* to be infallibly inspired, or that it *is* infallibly inspired. When the clergyman or the tract distributor makes this pretence to you, demand the evidence of it ; ask that this evidence be shown you on the spot, in the Bible : and, (if you can bring him to the point of attempting to show it,) point out to him the insufficiency or the utter inappropriateness (as the case may be) of what he offers you for proof. There is no need to raise objection to the doctrine until something plausibly approaching proof of it is offered.

When the *Independent* was edited by Rev. Dr. Joseph P. Thompson and Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon, a question upon this subject was addressed to that paper. The question and the editorial answer to it are contained in the following extract from the *Independent* of April 26th, 1860 : — "The same writer begs as a special favor that we will name in the *Independent* some one book containing what we, after carefully reading it, regard as *conclusive proof* that the whole Bible was written by inspiration of God. Most cheerfully do we comply with his request. That one book is the Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments ; translated out of the original tongues.

We name the English version, because we know nothing of the inquirer's acquaintance with the originals."

Three things are worthy of notice in this answer ; — first, the avoidance, by the Editor, of giving an opinion of the sufficiency of any one of the numerous books of pretended proof upon this subject written by his clerical brethren ; next, the impudence of offering an individual (whose character is the point under debate) to be the sole witness in his own behalf ; and third, the combined impudence and falsehood of offering as sufficient proof, that which contains not even a *claim* of the matter in question. If, according to the above declaration, the Bible really proves itself inspired, let its Reverend self-elected guardians begin by showing us where it makes the *claim*.

The hardihood with which the clergy and the "religious" press (so called) make assumptions in regard to the Bible is well illustrated by a paragraph, credited to "Dr. James Hamilton," which is constantly going the rounds of the religious newspapers, without a word of warning of the group of falsehoods expressed and implied in it. It is entitled — "David's Bible and ours," — and commences thus : — "In the days of King David, the Bible was a scanty book ; yet he loved it well and found daily wonders in it." After rehearsing "Genesis," "Exodus," "Leviticus," "Numbers," "Deuteronomy," "Joshua and Judges," "Job," and "Ruth," the paragraph proceeds — "These were David's Bible ; and, brethren, whatever wealth you have, remember that David desired his Bible beyond his riches. So thankful was he for such a priceless possession, that he praised God for its righteous judgments seven times a day."

The clerical editors of these papers are bound in fairness to let their readers know that there is not a particle of evidence that all these books were written, or that any of them were collected into one volume, so early as the time of David ; that there is not a particle of evidence that David ever saw even one of them ; and that the author of the paragraph above referred to was obliged to *alter* the passage he pretended to quote from a Psalm of David, to make it even *seem* to establish his fraudulent assumption. Instead of making such explanations, these editors place such extracts in their columns of religious reading, and leave them to make their natural impression upon the minds of readers not only unlearned, but prepossessed with belief in the truth of the matters there collected, and the honesty of their writers. And it is matter like this, crammed with false assumption and false assertion under the guise of piety, which constitutes the staple of the American Tract Society's publications.

These men, pretending to be disciples and followers, yes, even

divinely commissioned ambassadors of Jesus Christ, have the hardihood to teach a doctrine directly opposite to his, in regard to the infallibility of Scripture. Far from teaching that the Old Testament, the only portion of the Bible existing in his time, was an inspired and unerring rule of life, Jesus freely criticised its rules, sometimes enlarging, sometimes diminishing, and sometimes reversing their injunctions.

HOW DID JESUS TREAT THIS CLAIM?

How did he treat the Hebrew decalogue? a portion of the Jewish code which modern clerical writers have set up as "the moral law," binding upon Christians as well as Jews. So far from referring its authorship to God, Jesus does not even refer it to Moses, but quotes three of its provisions as traditions handed down by "them of old time," and quotes them for the purpose of showing that they need to be amended. He shows the sixth commandment of this code not to be strict enough, and declares hating to be wrong as well as killing; he shows the seventh not to be strict enough, and declares unchaste thought wrong, as well as unchaste action; he interferes still more radically with the third commandment, forbidding what that allowed, and declaring it wrong to swear at all, instead of wrong merely to violate your oath. He makes constant practical opposition to the injunction of the fourth commandment, so as to be popularly known to the devout Jews as a Sabbath-breaker. This man, they said, "cannot be of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day." He justified his disciples in travelling and laboring on that day. He commanded, in one case, the bearing of a burden on that day, in direct opposition, not only to the fourth commandment, but to the express and emphatic injunctions of Nehemiah and Jeremiah. And when accused in regard to this last act, he not only defended himself, but denied the statement (which they seem to have quoted to him from Genesis as authoritative) about God having "rested" after the work of creation. Jesus said plainly—"My father worketh hitherto." He never needed rest and never did rest.

All this is direct denial of the Jewish assumptions respecting the inspired character and the binding force of the commands recorded in their Scripture, the Old Testament. But there is much more evidence of the same kind. The injunctions about taking an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, which Jesus opposes and reverses, are no gloss of the Scribes and Pharisees, but emphatic and repeated precepts in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. These books contain numerous injunctions forbidding the eating of this, that and the

othe
"No
com
cont
only
mov
ples
defil
insis
about
othe
tatin
divo
diffe
He
Heb
origi
"the
death
utter
deri
saler
Ju
just
inde
Test
he o
He
to ju
much
a div
the t
art h
spak
he is
It
lenti
featu
persi
inspi
direc
teach

other kind of food, because to eat it would defile them. Jesus says, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man ; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man." These books further contain numerous injunctions concerning bathing and washing, not only of the hands and body, but of pots, cups and dishes, for the removal of ceremonial uncleanness. Jesus not only releases his disciples from these observances, saying, "to eat with unwashen hands defileth *not* a man," but he condemns the Scribes and Pharisees for insisting on these very commands of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, about "the washing of pots and cups ;" and these, as well as their other observances, he calls "the tradition of men." He also unhesitatingly sets aside the Old Testament rules respecting marriage and divorce, and intimates that God's law, from the beginning, was very different from the law given by Moses to the Jews on those subjects. He denies the statement made in Exodus that the manna which the Hebrews found in the wilderness was "from heaven." He refers the origin of the rite of circumcision not to Moses, nor to God, but to "the fathers." He sets himself against the penalty of stoning to death for adultery, which "Moses in the law commanded." And he utterly denied one of the fundamental ideas of the Jewish system, derived from the Old Testament, that worship in the temple at Jerusalem was more acceptable to God than elsewhere.

Just as Jesus was openly known to the Jews as a Sabbath-breaker, just so he was openly known to them as maintaining, and teaching, independence of the law of Moses, and the commands of the Old Testament. Obeying such of those precepts as he saw to be right, he obeyed nothing merely because it was contained in that code. He held himself at liberty to criticise it, to speak of it as imperfect, to judge for himself how much of it was to be observed and how much not, and to teach others so to judge. The people recognized a diversity, often amounting to opposition, between his teaching and the teaching of Moses. To one who defended Jesus they said, "Thou art his disciple ; but we are Moses' disciples. We *know* that God spake unto Moses. As for this fellow, we know not from whence he is."

It was the Jews, not the Romans, who pursued Jesus with unrelenting hatred, and finally caused him to be crucified ; and no one feature of the life and system of Jesus goes so far to account for this persistent hostility as his opposition to their cherished doctrine of the inspired character and infallible authority of their Scriptures, and his direction to his disciples to judge *of themselves* what is right. To teach new doctrines to God's chosen and peculiar people (as if they

were in darkness or ignorance!) was bad enough; but to pull down their cherished tradition of an infallible revelation given by God to Moses and the prophets, that was the unpardonable sin; that they thought worthy of death, even the death of the cross. Barabbas was guilty only of murder. This man was an impious wretch, a blasphemer, an opposer of their religion, the only *true* religion. The existence of this feeling among the Chief Priests, Scribes and Pharisees, accounts for their furious enmity to Jesus. Perhaps it is not too much to say that his denial of the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament was the main cause of his crucifixion.

HOW DID STEPHEN TREAT IT?

This view is corroborated by the fact that accusations of the same sort were made against the disciples of Jesus after his death, and that the words and acts of those disciples proved (substantially) the truth of these accusations. What was alleged against Stephen, the first Christian Martyr after Jesus? The witnesses declared that they had heard him speak blasphemous words *against Moses*, and against God, and against this holy place (the temple) *and the law*; and that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall *change the customs which Moses delivered us*.

Now, supposing Stephen actually to have taught (as no doubt he did) the very things that Jesus taught, the terms of accusation above quoted are the very form in which such teaching would present itself to the Jewish mind. No doubt, both Stephen and his Master *had* spoken against many of the customs enjoined by Moses and the prophets, and recorded in *the law*, the Old Testament; no doubt they did intend and expect "to change" many of the customs which Moses had delivered them, and which were recorded as laws in their holy Scripture. Such words and acts, and such systematic intent, would of course appear to a devout Jew to be *blasphemy* against Moses and against God, (just as the same sort of teaching in our own time has brought upon Theodore Parker the accusation of blasphemy). Nay, this single expression in Stephen's defence — "Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands" — coming, as it did, immediately after a reference to Solomon's temple, and contradicting, as it did, many passages in the Hebrew Scriptures which declare that temple to be God's chosen and special abiding-place, must have seemed the height of impiety, and a full justification of the charges made against him. Stephen the Martyr, therefore, is one of the witnesses against the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament.

HOW DID PAUL TREAT IT?

The same view is corroborated by a large part of the teaching and action of the Apostle Paul. He was a most determined opposer of the theory which claimed absolute inspiration and infallible authority for the Old Testament. Often making honorable mention (as Jesus and Stephen also did) of the true and good things contained in it, Paul never hesitated to oppose the errors and imperfections which appear in the same volume, to call some of the most cherished provisions of the Mosaic law "weak and beggarly elements," and to call the Decalogue itself "a ministration of death." He claimed for the despised Gentiles a rank equal with those whom the Old Testament called "the chosen people of God." He spoke of the Law as "a carnal commandment," described the "weakness and unprofitableness" of it, urged the absolute necessity of "a change" in it. Let it be noted that all these expressions of slight regard and disregard are used respecting parts or the whole of that Old Testament which our clergy maintain to have been infallibly inspired of God. Paul took a very different view of it.

One of the most significant and remarkable and valuable of the writings of Paul, is his Epistle to the Galatians. It is a severe rebuke to the Christians of Galatia for having fallen into the blunder of supposing that Christianity required them to receive the Hebrew Scriptures as their law, and obey the rules there laid down. Paul strongly, repeatedly and unequivocally asserts their entire freedom from "the law," the whole system of rules laid down by Moses, and recorded in the Old Testament. First vindicating that system as having answered a useful purpose in former times, he now declares its usefulness and obligation to have ceased. He first gives this decision respecting the Mosaic system as a whole, of course including the Jewish decalogue. He says—"The Law *was* our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ; but after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Then he turns to certain specific acts of obedience to this law which the Christians of Galatia had already begun to practise, namely, observance of the Sabbath and other Jewish festivals, and of circumcision, and strongly urges the discontinuance of these observances, calling them "weak and beggarly elements." He says—"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Yet nothing in the Old Testament was more emphatically commanded, both by Moses and the prophets, than the observance of days, and months, and times, and years. Paul objects to the whole system of Sabbatical observance, calling it "the yoke

of bondage." He then comes to circumcision. "Behold, I Paul say unto you that, if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." And again, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision." Yet nothing in the Old Testament was more solemnly, emphatically and repeatedly commanded than this rite of circumcision. Paul then declared himself free from Old Testament law, and taught his hearers that exemption from its rule was part of the freedom with which Christ had made them free.

THE TRUE VALUE OF THE BIBLE.

When the clergy shall consent to abandon their claim of infallibility for the Bible, the true value of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures will stand a better chance of recognition by the people. When the reason which God has given us shall be recognized as our proper guide in the study and interpretation of these, as of other books — when we can properly discriminate between their contents, taking the good and true, and recognizing the useless or injurious as the natural product of darker ages — when there shall be commentaries upon the Old and New Testaments suited to enlighten the ignorant without at the same time seeking to impose sectarian creeds, or fasten theological bonds upon them — then the knowledge of these books will grow, and the unspeakable value of large portions of both will be freely admitted.

C. K. WHIPPLE.

IMPEACHMENT.

MR. SUMNER has recently, in a brief speech made in the Senate, done much to prepare the country for the impeachment of President Johnson. He has strengthened the nerves of the republican press, and silenced many misgivings. Public opinion is rallying to support the movement inaugurated in Congress by Mr. Ashley's Resolution.

The case is new, and supplements our experience as a nation within the last few years, with a practical measure, affirming the full scope of a democratic system of government. The questions arise, What relation do our government officials sustain to the people? What have the people a right to demand of any man whom they have constituted an officer of their affairs? They have a right to demand that their business be ably and faithfully managed. Government officials in this country are, or should be, regarded simply as *agents*. They are

in matters of greater or lesser importance, as the case may be, to do the business of the Republic. The pomp of the older monarchical systems is foreign to our theory. We do not believe in government in any but the most modern sense. When we honestly confess our democratic faith, our idea of government appears unadorned and very simple. Our highest officer is a plain man with a salary of \$25,000 a year, employed for four years to execute the laws which other plain men as wise or wiser than himself have enacted. In the business contract which we call our "Constitution," we have it arranged that when "the President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States" commit what we consider to be "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors," they "shall be" impeached and "removed from office." As it reads in the bond all is fair and square.

The question of Mr. Johnson's removal should not be embarrassed by considerations of fear. What the moral sense of the country privately confesses, may be openly and safely acted upon. No one can doubt—not Andrew Johnson himself—but that the moral sense of the northern half of the country, at least, feels itself outraged as never before by the conduct of any other incumbent of the same office. He alone has called forth feelings of utter disgust. James Buchanan nearly succeeded in doing so, and but for the mishap that enrolled Johnson's name in the list of Presidents, we might have regarded his partial success as complete.

"Now has his fame grown almost white."

When, therefore, it is urged that, though by general confession, Mr. Johnson has been declared wholly unfit for the office he holds, yet it is not prudent and wise to try to impeach him, we reply, the moral sense of the country should have an opportunity to vindicate itself. Party prospects need not be contemplated. Questions of deranged finance, threats of renewed civil war, are to be cared for when these actually arise. The country is equal to all emergencies of this kind, if, indeed, such things shall attend the performance of a plain duty. But why this alarm whenever it is proposed to deal justly with the destroyer of the nation's peace? Is the finance of the country firmer, is the danger of civil outbreaks lessened, are real prosperity, and peace nigher with a pro-slavery President at Washington?

Mr. Sumner has impressively recalled these words of President Lincoln. "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think

anew, and act anew. We must disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save our country." In the past, danger has only arisen after a failure to proceed upon such advice. It need not be concealed that Mr. Lincoln himself lost the force of many great opportunities by his timidity in following his own councils. In the case of McClellan, what disgrace and weary months of disaster and suffering were submitted to in deference to supposed political dangers, and party necessities. Then, as now, we had threats of civil war in the North, assertions that the "chief" would appeal to the country, summon the army to his support, and "resist the revolutionary schemes of the enemies of the Constitution." But as soon as the order for McClellan's removal was issued, all this threatening ceased; we heard no more of "civil war in the North;" the "chief" became a "martyr," and moved out of the country. In the case of the Proclamation of Freedom to the Slaves, predictions of disturbance, of open war at the North, and assertions of the utter uselessness of the edict, — in which the President himself seemed at one time to join, saying, "It would be like the Pope's Bull against the comet," — were plenty. What followed that great event of Lincoln's administration is known to all the world. No disaster, but strength on every hand. Then for the first time we began to gather in the moral support of other lands. For the first time, then, our own citizens and soldiers knew the full meaning of the struggle, and felt that

"The years have never dropped their sand
On mortal issue vast and grand
As our's to-day."

We are now called upon to repeat a similar experience. We are to "disenthral ourselves," and save the country from what must otherwise be for years to come an irreparable disaster. To surmount the difficulties we must "rise with the occasion." Let Congress proceed with the investigation in whatever manner will secure a thorough and fair presentation of the case. If impeachment follow, three months from that date, with a loyal President at the helm, Andrew Johnson will seem as old, and be as nearly forgotten as Pierce and Buchanan. There are those who yet ask, "But what if Congress fail to impeach the President? will that not strengthen him and make matters still worse?" We answer, in the first place, this is not a proper question to consider. It was wise advise that Gasparin gave us at the commencement of the war: "It does not depend upon us to succeed but only to be *right*. Do what you *ought*. I know of no policy more luminous either in politics or elsewhere." The fear is that the President

has so guarded his acts that *technically*, under the forms of the law, a verdict cannot be made out against him. The *moral* verdict is already rendered. He cannot change that, nor escape its penalties. Men will distinguish between the man and his cunning, and honor Congress even for a failure in an honest attempt to relieve the country from the interference of one who is a disgrace to any people, and an ugly obstacle in the path of the proper reconstruction of the Union.

There need be no excitement. Let it be a cool, deliberate purpose, so well accomplished that it shall stand for all time as the record of a brave, determined people, who quietly held their public officers responsible for their behavior.

EDITOR.

RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.*

WE must now present an abridgment of the doctrine of M. Jean Reynaud and his proofs. The theologians will give their opinion of the theological arguments; we ask permission to examine only the philosophical proofs, and we wish, for his sake, that the texts with which he opposes the Church may be more conclusive than the arguments that he offers to the reason.

Here is the abridgment of his doctrine:—Our soul has lived before its birth in other worlds.—It finds upon earth a condition and an organization conformed to the conduct that it pursued in its anterior lives.—After death it passes into another planet, is incarnated in another body, and experiences a happiness or misery proportionate to its merits or faults.—The planets are infinite in number, and through all eternity God creates, at every instant, an infinite number of them; they are all peopled with intelligent beings, and serve as successive habitations for souls.—They form a series of worlds increasing in perfection; the destiny of each soul is to rise without ceasing from one world to another and higher world, to form for itself a body finer than that which it leaves, and to meet a greater happiness than that which it quits.—Blameful souls descend into unhappy planets; the pains that they suffer gradually correct their vicious inclinations, and bring them back through repentance to virtue.—The universe is thus the theatre of an infinite series of incessant transmigrations, all of which have for their object and effect the amelioration of beings, and manifest the justice and providence of God. No one will deny that this system is very fine, and that almost as much talent has been needed for imagining it as for constructing an epic poem. The question is whether it can be proved.

* By Mons. Henri Taine. Translated from THE RADICAL, and continued from page 314.

And first we had the right to hope that the author would commence by overthrowing the well-known and striking objections that physiologists and psychologists can multiply against him. When, as M. Reynaud does, you suppose the soul to be the creator of its body, you are bound to refute the facts which prove how dependent it is upon that body. When you make it journey from one end of the heavens to the other, you are bound to prove that it can detach itself from its nervous system, and travel a hundred million miles. M. Jean Reynaud passes over objections without seeing them, and lays down as a first principle the incarnations and the migrations which are the very things to be proved.

On the other hand, we have no proof for admitting that the planets are inhabited. There are only two that we can observe, the Earth and the Moon. According to all probability, the Moon is without life, and unfit for it; if the earth is peopled with intelligent beings, it has been for only a hundred or two hundred thousand years; that is to say, for a hundred or two minutes; appalling multitudes of ages rolled away before man was born upon it; a great part of its surface is uninhabitable; an upheaval of mountains—and we have had twenty of them—may swallow up our race to-morrow; it appears that we are only a momentary accident in its history, and we have no other inductions for deciding upon the population of the planets. M. Reynaud affirms without hesitation that they are all inhabited; one would say that he had returned from them. This is his second principle, self-evident, at least as evident as the first.

Suppose, however, that we admit the soul to be capable of migrations, and the stars to be peopled with intelligent beings; at best, these are only remote consequences, probable and not certain, which one reaches through desire and hope, rather than through certainty and proof; which you advance to the end of a psychology and an astronomy, as the magnificent and tottering crowning of the edifice. M. Jean Reynaud ascends all the stories of this edifice, climbs the highest tower, mounts the last summit, arrives at the extremity of the sharpest and most trembling spire, and says; "Here is the proper place for laying the foundations of my building." Is it a principle of architecture to build in the air?

Let us now examine the principal and the newest point of the system; the dogma that our soul has lived before its birth; and let us weigh the arguments that establish it, according to M. Reynaud.

The first argument is this:—"What shall we say of the many souls whose bad natural disposition is manifested from the very cradle? Some are dolts, others gross and brutal. Before even any act of intelligence has been produced, the features show that the worst instincts are present, and only wait awakening that they may enter upon their course. These souls have scarcely finished taking possession of life, and they are already corrupted! Will you oblige me to think that they have come into so vicious a state from the hands of God, whose every work, before it is self-spoiled can be only perfectly good?"

Here is a second proof: "It is impossible without our hypothesis to

reconcile the justice of God with the maladies and the sufferings of infants. What ! before the soul, which, according to you, has just been created, has given signs of life, shall God decide of his sovereign authority to join it to a body in which it will find only pains and lacerations : that is to say, in other words, that, when scarcely drawn forth from nothingness, and perfectly innocent, he sends it without further ceremony to punishment ! This may suit the omnipotence of a Moloch ; but for my part permit me to say, such an idea savors of blasphemy."

A third argument is, that "many children die at birth. It would be contrary to the providence of God to create their souls expressly for this life and at the same moment remove them from it."

"Finally, if the soul has not already lived before birth, it follows that God creates it in circumstances dishonorable to himself, for instance, at the moment of a rape or an adultery. It is to assist on such occasions that you oblige the Creator to go forth from his sublime repose ! The most shameful or the most wicked passion finds in him, so soon as it pleases, a faithful co-operator, who hastens to crown by an infinite complement what it has so wretchedly prepared for him ! No. I will never grant you that the miracle of the appearance of a new soul in the midst of the universe can take place at a summons of this sort."

Does it not seem to you that we are in the old Sorbonne ? All this discussion is taken from the books of Saint Augustine on Grace. In the nineteenth century behold us fallen upon the times of Origen. Do you not feel in argument of this sort a something antiquated, that offends and bids you not refute the book, but close it ? And add, that the book is full of them ; that M. Jean Reynaud transports himself always, for the purpose of reasoning, into the midst of the divine essence ; that from the infinity and justice of God he concludes the nature of the world, the history of souls, the system of their migrations. — God is infinite, he says ; therefore there is an infinity of souls and of worlds. — God must always act, in order that he may be always like himself ; therefore he creates from all eternity, and will always create, and at every moment an infinity of worlds. — God is good ; therefore he proposes, as the destiny of all his creatures, an indefinite progress towards perfection. — God is just ; therefore he conducts every soul after death into a world suited to its merits. — God creates beings in his image ; therefore he gives to every soul a power of forming and governing the body analogous to the omnipotence by which he himself fashions and organizes matters. — And a thousand other consequences of this same sort. — How long shall we make use of this method ? Is it not sufficiently condemned by experience ? Do we not know that, according to the hands which handle it, it can produce all systems ? Have we not made trial of all the uncertainty and temerity that it contains ? To define God like a figure of geometry, to deduce from this definition the rules of his action, to conduct him by the hand into the creation and government of the world, to revolt against facts when you do not find them conformed to the romance you have forged, to invent others at random to palliate increasing objections,

to arrange out of whole cloth the soul and matter, to govern and reform the universe as if you were God himself,—is this an enterprise that ought to have been renewed in our days? Let us then at least profit by the experience and the contradictions of our predecessors. It is not for nothing that there is a history of philosophy; we have only to open our eyes to see their folly, and flee the method that has precipitated them into such errors.—Let us recall what they have found in this way.—God is infinite, say the Alexandrines, infinitely productive, and can produce only those things that are analagous to his nature. And they conclude that, from Being, simple and one, principle of things, there flows a series of emanations, more and more complex, and less and less pure, the last of which are souls bound up in bodies.—God is a sublime calculator, says Leibnitz; therefore he must have made of the world the most ingenious machine possible, that is to say, invent the pre-established harmony of the soul and body, and the combinations of monads.—God, being perfect, says Malebranche, wills that his work shall be worthy of himself, and permits human liberty to introduce into it original sin, which brings about the priceless sacrifice of Jesus Christ.—God is good, says some system born of yesterday, Fourier, for instance; whence it follows that men are destined for perfect happiness, that they have only to find the proper form of association, and happiness will immediately flow upon the earth in torrents.—Give me any opinion whatever, I pledge myself to justify it by the nature of God. Give to Leibnitz the Calvinist doctrine of eternal and almost universal damnation, he will prove that it is the easiest thing in the world to reconcile with the providence of God. This kind of theology is a sort of bottomless pit, whence you may draw at pleasure the proof of all possible systems. If you consider a certain attribute of God, you will deduce a certain world; if another attribute, another world. However little you may make the balance incline to the side of justice or of goodness, to the side of intelligence or of power, all is changed. You have touched the central spring, and the immense machine rolls to the right or left without your being able to stop it. Quit then this scholastic and fantastic method; return to facts, to experience, to certainty; no longer expose philosophy to the contempt of the sciences. To estimate yours at its worth, we have only to enter a laboratory or an observatory, to apply to chemistry or astronomy, and hear what a chemist or an astronomer will reply to you.

In fact, since you have made use of the wisdom and omnipotence of God to explain the history of souls, you can make use of them to explain the history of bodies. You will say with the same right, and with as much certainty: God produces infinitely; therefore it contradicts his nature to admit sixty-four simple bodies, or any other limited number; chemistry, aided by theology, must lay down as a principle, that the number of simple bodies is infinite. God places order and unity everywhere; therefore we must recognize that all these bodies are different forms of one and the same matter, just as the different forces of nature are different effects of one and the same Providence;—and twenty other such propositions.—

What do these assertions signify in the presence of retorts, receivers, and reactions? And who does not feel that this language is that of a disciple of Raymond Lully, transported among the disciples of Lavoisier? Now, if this method is unreasonable when we are trying to understand bodies, why should it be sensible when we wish to obtain a knowledge of souls? Are there not in both cases facts to observe; dependencies to establish, laws to ascertain? Is there in either case anything else to do? Who, then is the author, if not a pupil of Saint Thomas, who has strayed off among those of Condillac, Bichat, and Dugald Stewart? He comes from another world, and has no place in this.

6. It is only with extreme repugnance that we enter into these questions of theology, or theodicy; our feet seem to fail us everywhere. M. Jean Reynaud is, as it were, in a falling house; we dare not even go up to fight him; we retire therefore, and we beg one of the inhabitants of the building to take our place, and charge himself with the refutation. Malebranche, for instance, will do it with pleasure and without trouble. He will prove to M. Jean Reynaud very solidly, that the world is not made for creatures, and that consequently they may be unhappy or wicked, without, for all that, being able to accuse God of injustice, impotence, or an evil disposition. He will establish that, "God was not obliged to attempt the most perfect work possible, but only the most perfect that could be produced by the wisest or divinest ways, so that any other work produced by any other way could not more exactly manifest the perfections that God possesses, and glories in possessing." Now to manifest these perfections, God must act by the most general and the most simple laws possible, and the working out of these laws must entail the unhappiness of individuals. It is a sad thing when a stone breaks my head, when an ill-formed brain makes a child stupid, when over-impetuous blood develops in a man wicked inclinations; but the world with its imperfections and general laws is finer than the world without its imperfections and general laws. So we have no right to accuse God of improvidence or injustice. We cannot from our miseries and our vices conclude an anterior life; we complain only through ignorance and arrogance. God owes us nothing, and owes himself everything. It is not man, it is God who is the centre and end of the world; and the universe is not made for us, but for him.

Such is the response of the theologians. Let us speak now like a common reasoner, and apply more closely, and to other beings the reasoning of the author. "Among men," he says, "some have at birth worse inclinations than others, suffer greater pains, or perish in the cradle. These deformities and miseries indicate that they have lived before their birth and are expiating past faults." Now the same argument proves that animals which are born have already lived. For why are certain species wild, while others are sanguinary? Why are several of these species fatally condemned by their organization, to become the prey and food of others? Why has one animal force, vigilance, agility, intelligence, when his neighbor is weak, stupid, sluggish and foolish? Why this primitive inequality

in the distribution of blessings and evils? If God is unjust in creating one man a slave, and another a master, he is unjust in making this animal a sheep, and another a lion. If a fool comparing himself with a man of genius, may conclude from his folly that he has pre-existed; an ox, comparing himself with man, may conclude from his stupidity that he has lived before birth. If the death of a new-born babe proves the pre-existence of the human soul, the destruction of the eggs of fishes proves the pre-existence of the soul of fishes. A codfish lays four million eggs, and there are only two hundred that are hatched; therefore all the codfish that come to nothing have lived in other worlds; therefore the souls of codfish experience transformations as well as the souls of men; they have travelled, as we have, in heaven, and can, like us, one day return to earth! Behold, as in Indian doctrines. Was it worth while to call to one's aid astronomy, geology, chemistry, and all the modern sciences, that we might fall again into the religion of Brahma?

M. Jean Reynaud loves equality, concord and fraternity. Does he know what they become in his system? A man who does not believe in the anterior life may have pity upon an unfortunate imbecile, upon a suffering invalid, upon a pauper dying of hunger. He will find in himself a thousand excuses for the villain, whom a narrow understanding, fiery passions, and bad examples may have hurried into crime. He knows that all these men are of the same species with himself; that they are guilty of no other crimes than those they have committed on this earth; that their conscience is born pure; that they have no original defilement; and that at birth they were equal to himself; but what will the partisan of the new system think? This wretched child, writhing on a pallet, smitten at his birth, by inheritance, and for his whole life, with a loathsome disease, expiates a crime that he committed in his preceding life. Since God is just, and since he adapts conditions to faults, let us measure the enormity of the crime by the enormity of the punishment, and conclude that we have before us the author of a black treason, of a parricide, or some action still more hateful, if there be any. We were ready to give our money and our service; our compassion is suddenly extinguished when we come in contact with theory, and we allow the justice of God to take its course. What idea shall we henceforth entertain of men? Almost all are unhappy; all suffer, all have evil inclinations; therefore all have committed faults, and they must have been great for such a life as we here experience to have been inflicted upon them. So you add to all present miseries and defilements the mass of past miseries and defilements. You make the unhappy blameful, and make the blameful still more blameful. What a spectacle, and what a changed aspect does the earth present. We thought we were in a hospital of invalids and paupers; M. Reynaud approaches and warns us that we are in a prison of convicts. Henceforth what argument will he oppose to the defenders of slavery? The masters have over the slaves not only the rights of a race of intelligent beings over a race of stupid beings, but, in addition, the rights of a race of just men over a race of sinners. And at the same time that the system

consecrates the humiliation of some, it consecrates the pride of others. Men of genius, great artists, thinkers, may consider themselves as of a different species from the common run of men ; they come from a purer world ; they have not been kneaded from the same clay with us ; they are as much above us as we are above brutes. M. Jean Reynaud even employs upon this subject Buddhist expressions. He represents certain superior beings " imploring as a favor the power of descending into lower societies, of becoming incarnate, of mingling with them," a kind of angels, exiled to our lower spheres of their own free will, that they may save us, or at least instruct us. Glowing disciples or mocking adversaries might draw from this strange conclusions. If the system is true, he who has discovered it is the sublimest of geniuses and the greatest benefactor of the human race : therefore, if there are among us superior beings clothed with the human form, the author is one of these beings. So, sir, you are an archangel, or at least an angel. What shall we say of a doctrine that conducts its author to the cruel extremity of being a God ?

Must we still further reckon among the proofs of the system the authority of Plato, Pythagoras, the Brahmins, and especially the Druids, great friends of the author, who desires to reawaken the Gallic spirit ? M. Pierre Leroux some time ago demonstrated another kind of renaissance by the testimony of Moses, Virgil, and Apollonius of Tyana, and we hoped that such proofs would no longer dare show themselves in the light of day. Because, in former times, twenty thousand shaggy savages, with long hair and beards, who lived in the woods, and burned men, were pleased to dream of journeys of the soul, we are not obliged to imagine the soul's circumnavigation about the heavens. Go who will to gather the sacred mistletoe in the forest of oaks ! Teutates may sleep in peace ; we will not awaken him. If we have respect for living traditions, we have no respect for dead traditions. We think that living traditions and dead traditions are of authority only with poets, and when we wish to believe, we are not going to revive religions.

7. Let us come at last to the secret reason, nowhere avowed, everywhere visible, that supports the system and permits it to do without proofs, probability, and at times even common sense. The dialogue of the two interlocutors may be summed up thus. — My romance, says the theologian, is more beautiful, better arranged, grander. — No, replies the philosopher, mine is. — You are deceived, replies the theologian, you see that in this point and this I accommodate myself better to man's desires and imaginations. — Wait, replies the philosopher, I can remove the difficulty. Just listen to one more article ; you will see that I promise man more happiness, that I allow to the universe greater magnificence than you do or than any one has yet done. — Eternal and unchangeable paradise, says the theologian, is the most desirable of all blessings. — No, says the philosopher ; the state that would be produced, if, by the gradual disgust of the erring with evil and their search for the good, hell should be continually emptied ; if all the saints, in the magnificent harmony of their aspirations, should rise

unceasingly to degrees of perfection increasing in sublimity ; if finally all creatures progressively consolidating their union with each other and with God, should form together, beneath the infinite majesty, but one unity of adorers ; — such a state would be evidently superior to that narrow paradise where there is place for only a part of creation. — My angels have never sinned, says the theologian. — The inhabitants of several of my planets, says the philosopher, have not committed an original fault, and have preserved themselves pure from all defilement. — I have myriads of happy spirits, says the first, distributed in nine celestial choirs. — And I, replies the other, have an infinite number of infinite series of marvellous creatures, whose perfection unceasingly approaches the perfection of God.

In fine, the system is reduced to this : — I desire this blessing, therefore I shall have it. My dream is agreeable, therefore it is true. This method is not new ; it has formed through all time the force of religions. “The light is beautiful, said a Greek of the time of Homer. It is pleasant to drive in a chariot, to wear purple tunics, to eat the nutritious back of victims, to wrestle on the grass, to listen to the sounds of the lyre ; therefore I shall enjoy all these blessings in the Elysian Fields. — I like to fight, said a Scandinavian, later, and I take pleasure in drinking beer. Therefore, once in the Walhalla, we shall empty from morn till night great horns of aurochs, and we shall cut each other to pieces through all eternity.” The Greek and the Scandinavian repeat the reasoning of M. Jean Reynaud, and their conclusions are as certain as his.

Incredible, he admits ! Every one will be born again in a world like the paradise he has hoped for. Fitted out with his myriads of planets the philosopher is furnish for all. Barbarian warriors will go to a world of battles ; Greek philosophers to an abode of tranquil conversations ; carnal Jews to a country of sensual satisfactions ; Christians of the middle age to a land of mystic contemplations. But here you invent too little. Why stop on so good a road ? Fourier reaches out his hand, and sets you the example. He loftily proclaims your principle ; he declares that all human passions and tastes must and can obtain their entire satisfaction ; when once desire and imagination are accepted as the measure of the possible and true, his paradise is more consistent and better proved. In that paradise which will be the earth transformed, wines, vegetables, culinary inventions will attain an unspeakable perfection ; great deputations from the principal states of the globe will meet to work and deliberate together for the improvement of little cakes ; for pastry is one of the delights of the mouth, and why should the mouth be deprived of one of its delights ? Fourier goes to the end of his logic ; and those who enter upon his road have no right to recoil before his absurdities.

M. Jean Reynaud is not the only one who has suffered himself to be swept away by such strange reasoning and such natural tendencies. Our greatest masters, whether consciously or unconsciously, have been attacked or slightly affected with the same evil ; and there is not one who has not, twenty times in his life, proved and propagated his doctrine by telling men

that it is consoling to the human race. The first and the most contagious of these examples was the "Genius of Christianity." Preceding apologists had spoken to the reason and proved their dogmas by facts and syllogisms. M. de Chateaubriand changed the method and proved Christianity by sentimental raptures and poetic paintings. The effect was immense, and everybody placed their hands upon so happily met and so powerful an arm. Every nascent doctrine believed itself obliged to prove that it had come at the right time ; that circumstances demanded it ; that men desired it ; that it had come to save the human race. It defended itself with the arguments of the commissary of police and placards, by proclaiming that it was conformed to public order and morality, and that the need of its coming had been everywhere felt. People imposed upon truth the obligation of being poetical and not of being true. They replied to manifest facts with their hands on their hearts, saying, "My heart forbids my believing you." They considered science as a garment that you try on, and send back, if it does not fit. Thread-bare doctrines were demonstrated by refuted arguments, and popularity and power were conquered at the expense of certainty and truth. We wish that M. Jean Reynaud may be the last defender of this method : it confounds *genera* (*elle confond les genres*), and no confusion is worse. The useful and the beautiful are not the true ; to overthrow the limits that separate them is to destroy the foundations that support them. To affirm that a doctrine is true, because it is useful or beautiful, is to place it among government machines or the inventions of poetry. To establish truth by foreign authorities is to take from it its own. Those proofs which it borrows from another source are like faithless soldiers, who surround it with noise and splendor before battle, but who desert while the fight is going on, and betray it without defence to its enemies. Let us, then, separate science from poetry and practical morality, as we have separated it from religion ; let us keep for each its proofs, its authority and its method ; let us keep for each its domain, and especially its own for philosophy. A philosopher is not a public furnisher, charged with constructing systems according to the caprices of his country and his age. Let him prove, and his task is done. So much the worse for the sensitiveness of men, if it cannot accommodate itself to proved facts. Science must not bend to our tastes ; our tastes must bend to its dogmas ; it is mistress and not servant ; and, if it is not mistress, it is the worst of servants, because it belies its nature and degrades its dignity. Those who make it an instrument of flattery make it an instrument of falsehood ; and to reign by such means is not worth the trouble of reigning. Let it not think of governing the crowd ; let it remain in its retreat ; let it attach itself only to the true : dominion will come to it later, or it will not ; no matter. It is a thousand miles above practice and active life ; it has reached its goal and has nothing more to do, or to strive for, as soon as it has seized the truth.

J. H. S.

NOTES.

PERHAPS an apology is due the greater number of the readers of THE RADICAL for the prominence lately given in these pages to the controversy which now agitates the Unitarian denomination. Our apology is, that we have felt that this controversy in a degree represented the greater one in which the whole world, at the present time, is earnestly engaged. This was not wholly a mistake. It does represent to some extent a phase of the larger movement. But we feel now that we shall be glad to abandon this local discussion as soon as we can, and enter upon the broader discussions of the time. Whether the Unitarian body shall remain one body, or divide into many, is, in our opinion, a question that cannot long interest more than a limited number of persons. The great engaging questions of the next century will be found outside any controversy concerning Church-organization, or the limitation of creeds. With entire respect for those who do not think as we do, we unhesitatingly say, that we see no escape from the meshes of creed but through the open door of the Church out into the world. The sweep of Protestantism will be discovered to be an effective protest against "ecclesiastical continuity." It was not the Pope, but the Church itself against which the ninety-five theses of the Reformation were in reality leveled. Private judgment will not stop until it makes the entire journey from Rome to Reason. The half-protest says, "Reform the Church. You cannot do more than supplant an old Church with a new one. The Church in some form, in bonds or in freedom, is permanent. It is not the offspring of man's will, but a necessity of his constitution." We reply, briefly, the Church was a necessity of man's constitution, only while he was under another law than the law of liberty. The constitution of the child necessitates a cradle and the nursery. Afterwards the constitution of the same person necessitates other dependencies. Our race is passing out of childhood. It claims its majority. It asks no more for the nurse, but begins to walk alone. What other interpretation shall we give the democratic sentiment now liberating all races and nations? Democracy implies manhood.

REV. DR. BARTOL gave the opening lecture in the Sunday Evening Course, at Fraternity Hall, Boston, on "The Church of the Spirit," which will be published in the next number of THE RADICAL.